LS70.2
CC
1883

38801

AUTHOR

Church Congress

TITLE

Report of the proceedings

DATE DUE	BORROWER'S NAME
JUN 6 '68	DENNIS DUFALLA 845-6000 410 HEARST MB UC BERK. X3804
	CBGTU

.2

1

Library of the
Church Divinity School
of the Pacific

THE

OFFICIAL REPORT

OF THE

CHURCH CONGRESS,

HELD AT

READING, OCTOBER, 1883.

THE

OFFICIAL REPORT

OF THE

CHURCH CONGRESS,

HELD AT READING,

ON OCTOBER 2ND, 3RD, 4TH, AND 5TH,

1883.

EDITED BY THE REV. C. DUNKLEY,

Vicar of S. Mary's, Wolverhampton.

GRADUATES THEOLOGICAL UNION LIBRARY 1962

CHURCH DIVINITY SCHOOL of the PACIFIC LIBRARY

London:

BEMROSE & SONS, 23, OLD BAILEY;

AND DERBY.

1883.

PRINTED BY BEMROSE AND SONS, DERBY;
AND 23, OLD BAILEY, LONDON.

L570.2
CC
1883

PREFACE.

HITHERTO the editorial duties connected with the Church Congress Report have been, I believe, generally undertaken by one of the local secretaries, or by a member of the committee. The departure from the custom of past Congresses this year is in consequence of the remarkably early publication of the Derby Congress Report. The Permanent Secretary (Ven. Archdeacon Emery) and the Congress Committee were desirous that the Report of the Reading Congress should be issued as promptly, and they determined to entrust the preparation of it to the same staff. We were again fortunate in being able to obtain the experienced help of Mr. C. Basil Cooke as Official Reporter; and I would here thankfully acknowledge the assistance I have received from him, in his capacity as sub-editor, while these pages have been preparing for the press.

It is due to the Publishers, Messrs. Bemrose & Sons, Derby, that I should mention the extreme care shown by their staff of compositors. The general accuracy of the first proofs was remarkable, and very considerably lessened my own labours. I need say no more; the Volume speaks for itself, when it is remembered that scarcely seven weeks have passed since the Congress was held.

For myself, I may perhaps be allowed to say just this, that I undertook the editorial work this year because I could not say "No" to the urgent request of my good friend, and fellow-worker of last year, Mr. H. H. Bemrose. The work of revision has been done under exceptional difficulties, which many of my readers will understand when I say that the charge of a parish of over 8,000 souls has been, of course, my first concern, and the editorial work in consequence relegated to overtime. Still, I trust that there will be found but few inaccuracies, and for these I must ask the indulgence of both Authors and Readers.

But it is quite plain that Reporter, Publisher, and Editor would have

38801

laboured in vain to produce the Report at this early date, if they had not been met by a corresponding diligence and promptitude on the part of those whose contributions to the several subjects discussed are contained therein. My grateful acknowledgments are therefore due to the Readers who courteously placed their MSS. in my hands, and to the Speakers, both selected and voluntary, who, with scarcely an exception, and that due to absence from home or insufficient address, considerately corrected and returned the Reporter's transcript, or the Publisher's proof, without loss of time. Nor can I forget the kind courtesy of those Speakers who, at my request, wrote out their speeches in full, after delivery, in order to save time and ensure correctness. It will easily be understood how difficult it must be for even the skilled and practised stenographer to report accurately upon subjects that are seldom discussed in public, and that abound in technical words and phrases.

There are one or two special features of this year's Congress that call for a short notice here.

(1) I have been struck in reading the proofs with the very considerable increase of discussion. This is a step in the right direction. There has been a demand for some years past for a reduction of the list of invited Speakers, so as to leave more time for debate. The Reading Committee considerately and bravely met that demand, and the results have, I venture to think, justified the step taken.

(2) A Men's Meeting for the discussion of Purity and the Prevention of the Degradation of Women, addressed by *men*, all, whether Speakers or Readers, selected by the Committee, was certainly an advance on last year's section devoted to the same subject.

This was a magnificent Session : the Town Hall was crowded in every part, the Right Rev. the President took the chair, and he was supported by His Grace the Archbishop of Canterbury, several of the bishops, and the leading clerical and lay members of the Congress.

I regret that we are obliged to introduce two appendices into this year's Report. Seven weeks will allow only the smallest margin for untoward delay or accident, and in the case of the speeches grouped together at the end of the Report, that margin of time was passed.

We have inserted, contrary to the unwritten Rules of Congress,

Canon Anson's paper on the Duty of the Church at Home to the Church in the Colonies, etc. Although the MS. did not arrive in time to be read at the Congress, it was felt to be too valuable to lose altogether, and the temporary loss has been thus far repaired by its publication.

Lastly, may I commend these points to the consideration of future Congress Committees?

First, Is it not possible to enlist the co-operation of the wage-earning class in our Congress proceedings by giving them a place both upon Committee and platform?

Second, the list of invited Readers and Speakers at past Congresses would have borne a much larger infusion of fresh blood. Could not ex-secretaries render good service in this direction, by reporting year by year to the Subjects Committee any rising specialists or able debaters in their respective neighbourhoods.

The Report is sent forth with the prayer that the reading of its pages may, through the help of the Holy Spirit, be blessed to the edification of the Church, and in the hope that thereby the Saviour's prayer—the Reading Congress motto—may find a more speedy fulfilment,

"THAT THEY ALL MAY BE ONE."

C. DUNKLEY.

S. Mary's Vicarage, Wolverhampton,
November 16th, 1883.

CONTENTS.

PAGE

Preface .. .. v.
Patrons, President, Vice-Presidents, and List of Committees, &c. .. .. xii.

TUESDAY, OCTOBER 2.

SERMON, by His Grace the Archbishop of Canterbury .. 1
SERMON, by the Right Rev. the Lord Bishop of Winchester 9
SERMON, by the Right Rev. the Lord Bishop of Meath .. 20

INAUGURAL ADDRESS, by the Right Rev. the President 29

RECENT ADVANCES IN NATURAL SCIENCE IN THEIR RELATION TO THE CHRISTIAN FAITH.

Chairman—The Right Rev. the President.

PAPERS :—Professor Flower .. 36
Bishop of Carlisle 43
Rev. Aubrey L. Moore .. 47
ADDRESSES :—Professor Pritchard 54
F. Le Gros Clark, Esq. .. 56
DISCUSSION :—Bishop Perry .. 62
Rev. C. L. Engstrom .. 64
Rev. W. D. Ground 65
The President 68

METHODS OF SECURING THE EXPRESSION OF THE OPINION OF THE LAITY.

Chairman—The Bishop of Lichfield.

PAPER :—S. Leighton, Esq., M.P. 68
ADDRESSES :—Rev. J. F. Ponsonby 72
Sir J. Mowbray, M.P. . 73
Sir George K. Rickards .. 75
DISCUSSION :—Rev. E. Miller .. 78
Earl Beauchamp 80
Rev. A. J. Foster 80
Rev. Theo. Bennett 81
Wm. Forsyth, Esq. . 81
Hon. and Rev. A. Legge .. 82
Rev. Dr. Hayman 83
Archdeacon Emery 84
Canon Gregory 84

RECENT ADVANCES IN BIBLICAL CRITICISM AND IN HISTORICAL DISCOVERY IN THEIR RELATION TO THE CHRISTIAN FAITH.

Chairman—The Right Rev. the President.

PAGE

PAPERS :—Rev. T. K. Cheyne .. 85
Rev. Prof. W. Sanday .. 91
Sir Charles W. Wilson .. 98
ADDRESSES :—Rev. H. G. Tomkins 104
Canon Rawlinson 107
DISCUSSION :—Dean of Chester 109
Rev. A. Hatchard 110
Rev. Canon Girdlestone .. 112
Dr. Geikie 113
Rev. V. H. Stanton .. 114

LAYMEN'S PRACTICAL WORK.

Chairman—The Ven. Archdeacon Pott.

PAPER :—Rev. H. T. Armfield 116
ADDRESSES :—G. A. Spottiswoode, Esq. 120
Professor Burrows 123
Hon. T. H. W. Pelham .. 126
DISCUSSION :—The Chairman .. 128
J. Trevarthen, Esq. .. 128
Rev. C. J. Thompson .. 130
James H. Millard, Esq. .. 131
Rev. W. Carlile 132
Rev. J. Cowden-Cole . 133
Rev. H. Overy 134

WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 3.

WOMEN'S WORK.

Chairman—The Bishop of Winchester.

PAPERS :—Canon Carter 135
Dean of Chester 140
ADDRESSES :—Dr. Acland 146
J. G. Talbot, Esq., M.P. 148
DISCUSSION :—Archdeacon Emery 150
Earl Nelson 152
Rev. B. Compton 153
Bishop of Meath 154
Archdeacon Darby 155
Carleton Baynes, Esq. . 157
Archdeacon Bathurst .. 158
Rev. George Everard .. 159
Bishop of Bedford 160
The Chairman 160

PURITY, AND THE PREVENTION OF THE DEGRADATION OF WOMEN AND CHILDREN.

Chairman—The Right Rev. the President.

PAGE
ADDRESS :—The President .. 162
PAPERS :—Rev. Dr. Ridding .. 162
Hon. and Rev. A. T. Lyttelton 170
Canon W. Butler 175
Admiral A. P. Ryder .. 181
ADDRESSES :—Canon Scott Holland 194
Rev. A. G. Butler .. 196
Rev. V. H. Stanton .. 197
Lord Brabazon 199
W. H. Heaton, Esq. .. 204

THE MARRIAGE LAWS.

Chairman—The Right Rev. the President.

ADDRESS :—The President .. 205
PAPERS :—Archdeacon Randall 205
Archdeacon Hessey .. 214
ADDRESSES :—Hon. G. Sclater-Booth, M.P. 223
J. Walter, Esq., M.P. . 225
DISCUSSION :—Right Hon. A. J. Beresford Hope, M.P. 229
Rev. Dr. Leighton Colman 230
Rev. M. W. Mayow .. 232
Canon Trevor 233
Rev. S. Phillips 234
Colonel Makins, M.P. .. 225
Rev. Thomas Vincent .. 236

PAUPERISM AND THRIFT.

Chairman—The Bishop of Carlisle.

PAPER :—The Rev. W. L. Blackley 237
ADDRESS :—Mark Knowles, Esq. 243
PAPER :—Rev. E. Sturges .. 245
ADDRESS :—W. S. Portal, Esq. 251
DISCUSSION :—The Chairman .. 253
Rev. Prebendary Salmon 253
Rev. W. S. Carter .. 255
Rev. H. Overy 256
Rev. J. Hasloch Potter .. 257
H. Wright, Esq. . .. 257
Rev. G. H. Woolley .. 257
J. Butcher, Esq. 258
Rev. Theo. Bennett .. 259

WORKING MEN'S MEETING.

Chairman—The Right Rev. the President.

ADDRESSES :—The President .. 260
Bishop of Carlisle .. 262
The President 266
Bishop of Bedford .. 266
Canon Barry 269
Canon Hole 272
Sir John Mowbray .. 276
The President 278

OVERFLOW MEETING.

Chairman—The Very Rev. the Dean of York.

PAGE
ADDRESSES :—The Chairman .. 278
Canon Knox-Little .. 281
Rev. Henry Roe 281
Bishop Abraham 283
Archdeacon Emery .. 285

FOREIGN MISSIONS.

Chairman—The Bishop of Meath.

PAPER :—Bishop of Lahore .. 288
ADDRESSES :—Sir W. Muir .. 296
Archdeacon Farler .. 299
Rev. W. T. Storrs .. 301
DISCUSSION :—Rev. S. Phillips 303
General Maclagan .. 304
Bishop Mitchinson .. 305
Rev. Dr. May 306
Rev. W. H. Penney .. 308
Rev. E. Bickersteth .. 308
Rev. H. Rowley 309
Canon Hoare 309
Hon. and Rev. H. Douglas 310
The Chairman 310

THURSDAY, OCTOBER 4.

THE CHURCH AND THE UNIVERSITIES.

Chairman—The Right Rev. the President.

PAPERS :—Rev. R. Appleton .. 310
Canon Wordsworth .. 317
ADDRESSES :—Canon King .. 322
Rev. J. E. C. Welldon .. 324
DISCUSSION :—Hon. and Rev. A. T. Lyttelton 327
Professor Ince .. . 329
Archdeacon Denison .. 330
Rev. A. M. W. Christopher 331
Rev. E. S. Talbot . 333
Sir John Conroy 334
Archdeacon Emery .. 334
Sir J. Mowbray, M.P. .. 336
Rev. T. G. Headley .. 337

SUNDAY TEACHING FOR THE CHILDREN OF THE UPPER, MIDDLE, AND LOWER CLASSES.

Chairman—The Bishop of Bedford.

PAPERS :—Rev. F. F. Goe .. 338
Rev. R. W. Randall .. 343
ADDRESSES :—J. G. Talbot, Esq., M.P. 348
T. C. Thompson, Esq., M.P. 351
DISCUSSION :—Rev. J. T. Jeffcock 353
Canon F. J. Holland . 354
J. H. Millard, Esq. .. 355
Dr. Belcher 357

DISCUSSION (*Con.*):— PAGE
Canon Ellison 358
Rev. C. Barnwell 359
Rev. Dr. Griffith 360
Sir J. E. Philipps 360
Rev. T. Stevens 361
Rev. J. G. Bird 362
Rev. J. F. Osborne .. 362
Canon Fisher 363
The Chairman 363

THE CHURCH AND PUBLIC SCHOOLS.

Chairman—The Right Rev. the President.

PAPERS:—Rev. E. C. Wickham 364
Rev. E. W. Sergeant .. 368
ADDRESS:—Bishop Abraham .. 374
DISCUSSION:—Bishop of Bedford 377
Archdeacon Balston .. 378
Rev. G. Everard 380
Dean of Chester 381
The President 382
Archdeacon Denison .. 383
Archdeacon Emery .. 384
C. T. Murdoch, Esq. .. 385
Dr. Wood 386
Rev. H. B. Gray 386
Rev. A. Carr 387

THE TREATMENT OF ELEMENTARY EDUCATION BY THE STATE IN ITS BEARING ON VOLUNTARY SCHOOLS.

Chairman—Sir J. Mowbray.

PAPERS:—Right Hon. J. G. Hubbard, M.P. 388
I. H. Wilson, Esq. .. 393
ADDRESSES:—Sir E. Hay Currie 399
Canon Gregory 401
DISCUSSION:—Rev. J. C. Cole 404
Rev. W. F. Norris .. 405
H. C. Richards, Esq. .. 406
Rev. C. J. Thompson .. 406
Rev. Canon Bowlby .. 407
Rev. W. M. Lane .. 408
Rev. H. R. Baker .. 409
Archdeacon Darby .. 409
Rev. H. Roe 410
Major Fergusson 411
Rev. C. D. Goldie .. 411

SUNDAY OBSERVANCE.

Chairman—The Right Rev. the President.

PAPER:—Rev. Preb. Moore .. 412
ADDRESSES:—Dean of York .. 417
Rev. H. C. Shuttleworth 422
DISCUSSION:—Mr. Clifton .. 426
Rev. C. D. Du-Port .. 426
Rev. S. D. Headlam .. 428

DISCUSSION (*Con.*):— PAGE
The President 429
Canon Hoare 429
Dr. Phillimore 430
Rev. C. M. Marson .. 431
Rev. H. G. Tomkins .. 432

THE SERVICES OF THE CHURCH AND THEIR ADAPTATION TO MODERN NEEDS.

Chairman—The Ven. Archdeacon Pott.

PAPERS:—Bishop of Bedford .. 433
Canon Medd 437
ADDRESSES:—Rev. B. Compton 443
S. Gedge, Esq. 446
DISCUSSION:—Right Hon. A. J. B. Beresford Hope, M.P. 448
Canon Girdlestone .. 449
Canon Venables 450
Earl Nelson 452
Rev. W. Carlile 452
Rev. S. Phillips 453
James Parker, Esq. .. 453
Rev. J. H. Buchanan .. 454

FRIDAY, OCTOBER 5.

PERSONAL RELIGION.

Chairman—The Right Rev. the President.

ADDRESS:—The President .. 455
PAPERS:—Canon King 455
Rev. F. J. Chavasse .. 461
ADDRESSES:—The Hon. C. L. Wood 464
Canon Hoare 467
Rev. Herbert James .. 469
E. Stock, Esq. 471
The President 472

ECCLESIASTICAL COURTS.

Chairman—The Very Rev. the Dean of York.

PAPER:—Rev. Dr. Hayman .. 472
ADDRESS:—Canon Trevor .. 484
DISCUSSION:—Sydney Gedge, Esq. 484
Lord E. S. Churchill .. 485
Rev. Dr. Porter 488
Professor Burrows 489
Rev. Dr. Belcher 492
Rev. G. H. Sumner .. 492
J. T. Dodd, Esq. 494
Bishop of Winchester .. 495
Chancellor Espin 496
Rev. Henry Roe 498
Rev. Theo. Bennett .. 498
H. C. Richards, Esq. .. 499
Rev. F. N. Oxenham .. 500
Rev. R. T. West 501

ECCLESIASTICAL COURTS.

Chairman—The Right Rev. the President.

	PAGE
ADDRESS:—The President ..	502
PAPER:—Dr. Phillimore	502
ADDRESS:—L. T. Dibdin, Esq. ..	506
DISCUSSION:—James Parker, Esq.	510
Bishop Perry	511
Rev. H. Fletcher	512
Archdeacon Emery ..	513
Dean of Windsor	514
Rev. R. W. Randall ..	515
Hon. C. L. Wood ..	520
Chancellor Espin	521
Right Hon. A. J. B. Beresford Hope, M.P. ..	522
The President	523
Right Hon. A. J. B. Beresford Hope, M.P. ..	524
The President	524

THE RELATION OF THE CHURCH AT HOME TO THE CHURCH IN THE COLONIES AND IN MISSIONARY DIOCESES.

Chairman—Sir J. Mowbray, M.P.

	PAGE
PAPER:—Canon Barry ..	525
ADDRESSES:—Canon Anson ..	530
Bishop Mitchinson ..	533
DISCUSSION:—Earl Nelson ..	539
Bishop Abraham	537
Rev. Dr. L. Colman ..	538
Sir A. Arbuthnot	539
Rev. E. C. Paget	540
Hon. and Rev. H. Douglas	541
Rev. Thomas Barker ..	542
Rev. W. S. Darling ..	542
Prebendary Salmon ..	543
Canon Jelf	543
Rev. H. Huleatt .. .	544
Rev. R. B. Dickson ..	545

CONVERSAZIONE AND FINAL MEETING.

Sir John Mowbray, M.P.	546
The President	547
The Mayor	547
Canon Hoare	547
J. Walter, Esq., M.P. ..	548
Archdeacon Balston ..	548
Dr. Acland	548
Dean of York	548
Rev. N. T. Garry	549
Archdeacon Emery ..	549
Appendix A	550
Appendix B	551
List of Church Congresses ..	554
Index of Speakers, etc.	555

Church Congress, 1883.

TWENTY-THIRD ANNUAL MEETING.

Patrons.

The Most Reverend the Lord Archbishop of Canterbury.
The Most Reverend the Lord Archbishop of York.

President.

The Right Reverend the Lord Bishop of Oxford.

Vice-Presidents.

CLERGY.

The Lord Archbishop of Armagh.
The Lord Archbishop of Dublin.
The Lord Bishop of London.
The Lord Bishop of Durham.
The Lord Bishop of Winchester.
The Lord Bishop of Ripon.
The Lord Bishop of Norwich.
The Lord Bishop of Bangor.
The Lord Bishop of Gloucester and Bristol.
The Lord Bishop of St. Albans.
The Lord Bishop of Hereford.
The Lord Bishop of Peterborough.
The Lord Bishop of Lincoln.
The Lord Bishop of Salisbury.
The Lord Bishop of Carlisle.
The Lord Bishop of Bath and Wells.
The Lord Bishop of Chichester.
The Lord Bishop of Ely.
The Lord Bishop of St. David's.
The Lord Bishop of Rochester.
The Lord Bishop of Lichfield.
The Lord Bishop of Liverpool.
The Lord Bishop of Newcastle.
The Lord Bishop of Llandaff.
The Lord Bishop of Truro.
The Lord Bishop of Sodor and Man.
The Lord Bishop of Meath.
The Lord Bishop of Tuam.
The Lord Bishop of Derry.
The Lord Bishop of Kilmore.
The Lord Bishop of Cork.
The Lord Bishop of Limerick.
The Lord Bishop of Moray, Primus of Scotland.
The Lord Bishop of St. Andrews.
The Lord Bishop of Edinburgh.
The Lord Bishop of Glasgow.
The Lord Bishop of Brechin.
The Lord Bishop of Aberdeen.
The Lord Bishop of Argyll and the Isles.
The Lord Bishop of Dover.
The Lord Bishop of Nottingham.
The Lord Bishop of Bedford.
The Lord Bishop of Colchester.
Bishop Perry.
Bishop Short.
Bishop Ryan.
Bishop Oxenden.
Bishop Jenner.
Bishop Courtenay.
Bishop Tufnell.
Bishop Kelly.
Bishop Titcombe.
Bishop Mitchinson.
Bishop Cheetham.
Bishop Staley.
Bishop Harper.
Bishop Bromby.
Bishop Macdougall.
The Very Rev. the Dean of Christ Church.
The Very Rev. the Dean of Windsor.
The Very Rev. the Dean of St. Paul's.
The Very Rev. the Dean of York.
The Very Rev. Lord Alwyne Compton, The Dean of Worcester.
The Very Rev. the Dean of Manchester.
The Very Rev. the Dean of Lichfield.
The Ven. the Archdeacon of Oxford.
The Ven. the Archdeacon of Berkshire.
The Ven. the Archdeacon of Buckingham.
*The Ven. the Archdeacon of Ely.

* *Permanent Secretary to the Church Congress.*

The Rev. the Provost of Queen's.
The Rev. the President of Trinity.
The Rev. the Provost of Worcester.
The Rev. the Principal of Hertford.
The Rev. the Warden of Keble.
The Rev. the Principal of St. Mary Hall.
The Rev. the Principal of St. Edmund Hall.
The Rev. the Provost of Eton.
The Rev. Canon Heurtley, Christ Church.
The Rev. Canon Bright, Christ Church.
The Rev. Canon King, Christ Church.
The Rev. Canon Ince, Christ Church.
The Rev. Canon Driver, Christ Church.
The Rev. Lord W. Russell, St. George's, Windsor.
The Rev. the Hon. Canon Courtenay, St. George's, Windsor.
The Rev. Canon Anson, St. George's, Windsor.
The Rev. Canon Boyd Carpenter, St. George's, Windsor.
The Rev. John Wilder, Fellow of Eton.
The Rev. Sir John Hoskyns, Bart.
The Rev. Sir John C. Hawkins, Bart.
The Rev. H. Golding Palmer.

LAITY.

His Grace the Duke of Buckingham, Lord Lieutenant of Buckinghamshire.
The Earl of Craven, Lord Lieutenant of Berkshire.
Sir H. Dashwood, Bart., Lord Lieutenant of Oxfordshire.
His Grace the Duke of Grafton, K.G.
The Marquis of Salisbury, K.G., Chancellor of the University of Oxford.
The Earl of Carnarvon, High Steward of the University of Oxford.
The Earl of Jersey.
The Earl Brownlow.
The Earl Nelson.
Viscount Barrington.
Viscount Valentia.
Lord Boston.
Lord Carington.
Lord De Mauley.
Lord Chesham.
Lord Penrhyn.
Lord Cottesloe.
Major Thoyts, High Sheriff of Berkshire.
W. H. Fox, Esq., High Sheriff of Oxfordshire.
Right Hon. Sir John Mowbray, Bart., M.P.
Right Hon. Sir Robert J. Phillimore, Bart., D.C.L.
Right Hon. W. H. Smith, M.P.
Right Hon. A. J. B. Beresford Hope, M.P.
Right Hon. J. G. Hubbard, M.P.
The Hon. G. C. Brodrick, Warden of Merton.
Sir H. Verney, Bart., M.P.
Sir R. Harvey, Bart., M.P.
Sir P. Hunter, Bart.
Sir F. Burdett, Bart.
Sir John Conroy, Bart.
Sir W. T. Herschel, Bart.
Sir W. Anson, Bart., Warden of All Souls.
Sir R. Lloyd-Lindsay, M.P., K.C.B., V.C.
The Mayor of Reading.
The Mayor of Oxford.
The Mayor of Buckingham.
The Mayor of Maidenhead.
E. W. Harcourt, Esq., M.P.
J. Walter, Esq., M.P.
P. Wroughton, Esq., M.P.
Colonel North, M.P.
Colonel Makins, M.P.
J. G. Talbot, Esq., M.P.
G. W. R. Russell, Esq., M.P.
R. Benyon, Esq., High Steward of Reading.
Colonel Gray.
Major Slater Harrison.

GENERAL COMMITTEE.

CHAIRMAN—The Lord Bishop of Oxford.

CLERGY.

The Rev. S. T. Adams, Great Horwood.
The Rev. Canon Anson, Windsor, V.P.
The Rev. Canon Ashhurst, Waterstock.
The Rev. J. B. Anstice, Hungerford.
*†The Rev. J. T. Brown, St. Paul's, Wokingham.
The Rev. H. Barter, Shipton, Chipping Norton.
The Rev. E. Barber, Chalfont St. Giles.
The Hon. and Rev. A. E. Bertie, Albury, Oxford.
The Rev. J. C. Blomfield, Launton, Bicester.
The Rev. S. J. Bowles, Beaconsfield.
*The Rev. Cecil F. J. Bourke, St. Giles', Reading.

The Rev. H. Boyd, Principal of Hertford College, Oxford, V.P.
The Rev. J. H. Brookes, Steeple Aston.
The Rev. A. Bros, Shabbington Vicarage, Thame.
†The Rev. J. S. Brownrigg, 72, Winchester Street, London, S.W.
†The Rev. Canon Butler, Wantage.
†The Rev. Canon Bright, Christ Church, Oxford, V.P.
The Rev. Canon Bull, Lathbury.
The Rev. Bryant Burgess, Latimer, Chesham.
The Rev. H. Burney, Wavendon, Woburn.
The Rev. D. P. Chase, Principal of St. Mary Hall, Oxford, V.P.
†The Rev. A. Carr, St. Sebastian's, Wokingham.
The Rev. W. E. D. Carter, Sarsden Rectory, Chipping Norton.
†The Rev. Canon Boyd Carpenter, Windsor, V.P.
†The Rev. Canon Carter, Clewer, Windsor.
†The Rev. F. J. Chavasse, New Inn Hall Street, Oxford.
The Rev. A. M. W. Christopher, St. Aldate's, Oxford.
The Rev. W. E. Chapman, Faringdon.
The Rev. R. Chilton, High Wycombe.
The Rev. J. C. Clutterbuck, Wittenham.
The Rev. G. T. Cooke, Beckley, Oxford.
The Rev. F. M. Cunningham, Brightwell, Wallingford.
The Rev. Canon Chamberlain, St. Thomas, Oxford.
The Rev. Canon Courtenay, Windsor, V.P.
The Rev. Canon Driver, Christ Church, Oxford, V.P.
The Rev. R. Bruce Dickson, Cadmore End, High Wycombe.
The Rev. C. D. DuPort, Reading.
The Rev. Canon Evetts, Monks Risborough.
The Rev. P. R. Egerton, Bloxham, Banbury.
The Rev. Conyngham Ellis, Cranbourne, Windsor.
†The Rev. Canon Ellison, Great Haseley, Tetsworth.
The Rev. W. C. Raffles Flint, Sunningdale.
The Rev. A. Fearon, Great Marlow.
†The Rev. Canon Furse, Westminster Abbey.
†The Rev. G. N. Freeling, Merton College, Oxford.
*†The Rev. Nicholas T. Garry, St. Mary's, Reading.
†The Rev. Canon Girdlestone, Wycliffe Hall, Oxford.
†The Rev. C. O. Goodford, D.D., Provost of Eton, V.P.
†The Rev. R. Gee, D.D., Windsor.
The Rev. W. C. Gibbs, Abingdon.
The Rev. H. J. Gepp, Adderbury, Oxford.
†The Rev. D. Greig, Addington Vicarage, Winslow.
†The Rev. T. H. Greene, Claydon Vicarage, Winslow.
The Rev. E. I. Gardiner, Newbury.
*The Rev. J. Cecil Grainger, Holy Trinity, Reading.
The Rev. W. E. C. Austin Gourlay, Stanton St. John, Oxford.
The Rev. H. B. Goodrich, Hardmead, Newport Pagnell.
The Rev. H. B. Gray, Bradfield.
The Rev. R. C. F. Griffith, Colnbrook, Bucks.
The Rev. H. G. Grey, Trinity, Oxford.
*The Rev. J. M. Guilding, St. Laurence, Reading.
The Rev. J. J. Hornby, D.D., Eton College.
The Rev. R. Holt, Hillesden, Buckingham.
The Rev. Sir J. Hawkins, Bart., Ellesborough, Tring, V.P.
The Rev. F. B. Harvey, Cheddington Rectory.
The Rev. E. M. Holmes, Marsh Gibbon, Bicester.
The Rev. Sir J. Hoskyns, Bart., Aston Tirrold, V.P.
The Rev. T. H. Archer Houblon, Wantage.
The Rev. Canon Heurtley, Christ Church, Oxford, V.P.
*The Rev. C. Robertson Honey, St. Bartholomew's, Earley.
†The Rev. W. Inge, Provost of Worcester, Oxford, V.P.
†The Rev. Canon Ince, Christ Church, Oxford, V.P.
The Rev. S. B. James, North Marston, Winslow.
†The Rev. Canon King, Christ Church, Oxford, V.P.
The Rev. J. B. Kane, Bicester.
The Rev. A. Kennion, Gerard's Cross.
The Rev. F. G. Kiddle, Buckingham.
†The Rev. J. R. King, St. Peter's, Oxford.
†The Rev. E. A. Knox, Merton College, Oxford.
The Rev. M. E. Kirkland, Hedsor, Beaconsfield.
The Rev. J. M. Lester, Stoney Stratford.
The Rev. Canon Linton, Oxford.
The Rev. R. Monck Mason, Woolhampton.

The Rev. J. R. Magrath, Provost of Queen's, Oxford, V.P.
The Rev. W. D. Macray, Ducklington Rectory, Witney.
The Rev. C. C. Mackarness, Aylesbury.
The Rev. A. Majendie, Woodstock.
The Rev. S. F. Marshall, Farnham Royal.
The Rev. W. E. Malaher, Weston Turville, Tring.
The Rev. E. Moore, St. Edmund Hall, Oxford, V.P.
†The Rev. A. Moore, 2, Keble Terrace, Oxford.
The Rev. Canon Menzies, Great Shefford, Hungerford.
The Rev. E. Miller, Bucknell Rectory, Bicester.
The Rev. G. W. Murray, Shrivenham.
The Hon. and Rev. J. H. Nelson, Shaw, Newbury.
The Rev. A. Newcombe, Steeple Claydon.
The Rev. W. Foxley Norris, Witney.
The Rev. O. Ogle, Oxford.
The Rev. C. M. Ottley, Newport Pagnell.
The Rev. Professor C. Prichard, Keble Terrace, Oxford.
The Hon. and Rev. R. Parsons, Sandhurst.
*†The Rev. Canon Payne, St. John's, Reading.
*The Rev. John Percival, President of Trinity College, Oxford, V.P.
†The Rev. North Pinder, Rotherfield Greys.
The Rev. H. A. Pickard, Airedale, Oxford.
The Rev. P. W. Phipps, Slough.
The Rev. R. Pigott, Grendon, Underwood, Aylesbury.
The Rev. S. Phillips, Nuneham.
The Rev. D. Paul, Bearwood.
The Rev. G. Phillimore, Ewelme.
The Rev. C. F. Porter, Banbury.
The Rev. G. Purdue, Challow, Wantage.
The Rev. F. Pilcher, St. Clement's, Oxford.
†The Rev. E. G. Punchard, Linslade.
*†The Rev. M. Powley, Purley.
The Rev. Canon Lord W. Russell, Windsor, V.P.
The Rev. C. A. Raymond, St. Mary's, Wallingford.
The Rev. Canon Russell, The Grange, Chalfont St. Peter, Gerards Cross.
The Rev. J. Rigaud, Magdalen College, Oxford.
The Rev. A. H. De Romestin, Freeland, Oxford.
The Rev. R. F. Rumsey, Burnham.
†The Rev. Canon Slatter, Whitchurch.
†The Rev. Canon Savory, Binfield.
The Rev. W. G. Sawyer, Maidenhead.
The Rev. J. Shephard, Eton, Windsor.
The Rev. G. F. Slade, Lewknor, Tetsworth.
*The Rev. S. H. Soole, Greyfriars', Reading.
The Rev. A. Shute, Windsor.
The Rev. E. Sturges, Wokingham.
The Rev. S. Sturges, Wargrave.
The Rev. W. A. Spooner, 11, Keble Terrace, Oxford.
†The Rev. C. W. Stubbs, Granborough.
*The Rev. C. H. Travers, Englefield.
The Rev. J. H. Thompson, Datchet, Windsor.
†The Rev. E. S. Talbot, Warden of Keble College, Oxford, V.P.
The Rev. W. P. Trevelyan, Calverton, Stoney Stratford.
*The Rev. G. I. Tubbs, Reading.
*The Rev. G. K. Turner, Christ Church, Reading.
The Rev. A. Valpy, Stanford, Dingley.
The Rev. W. Walker, Reading School.
The Rev. E. Warre, Eton College.
The Rev. T. Williams, Aston Clinton, Tring.
†The Rev. R. J. Wilson, Radley College.
†The Rev. E. C. Wickham, Wellington College.
The Rev. E. Penwarne Wellings, Stanford-in-the-Vale, Faringdon.
The Rev. John Wood, Wolverton, Bucks.
The Rev. T. J. Williams, Waddesden, Aylesbury.
The Rev. W. Wood, D.D., Cropredy, Leamington.
The Rev. John Wilder, Sulham, V.P.
†The Rev. Canon Wordsworth, 1, Keble Terrace, Oxford.
†The Rev. F. Young, Aylesbury.

LAITY.

*C. J. Andrewes, Esq., Broad Oak, Reading.
†Sir W. Anson, Bart., Warden of All Souls, V.P.
*F. W. Albury, Esq., Parkside, Reading.
*R. Attenborough, Esq., Whitley Grove, Reading.
The Earl Brownlow, Ashridge, V.P.
Viscount Barrington, Becketts, V.P.
Sir F. Burdett, Bart., Shrivenham, V.P.

*George Russell Butler, Esq., Layston House, Reading.
†H. C. Barnett, Esq., Glympton Park, Woodstock.
*F. C. C. Barnett, Esq., Kelvyn, Reading.
*A. C. Bartholomew, Esq., Park House, Reading.
*J. T. Blowers, Esq., Victoria Square, Reading.
*†H. B. Blandy, Esq., Cliffords, Reading.
W. F. Blandy, Esq., Downshire Square, Reading.
*F. J. Blandy, Esq., Freemantle Lodge, Reading.
Charles E. Boone, Esq., 1, Penrhyn Villas, Bulmershe Road, Earley.
*Major Battiscombe, Sherwood Lodge, Reading.
A. Beale, Esq., Somerley, Reading.
*R. Bracher, Esq., Sedgehill, Reading.
*R. Bradley, Esq., Western Elms, Reading.
*R. Benyon, Esq., Englefield House, V.P.
John Butler, Esq., Bicester.
†Professor Burrows, All Souls, Oxford.
†J. S. Bowles, Esq., Milton House, Abingdon.
T. W. Barrows, Esq., Hawkesworth Lodge, Banbury.
A. H. C. Brown, Esq., Kingston Blount, Tetsworth.
*E. J. Blackwell, Esq., 12, Eldon Road, Reading.
Herbert Bullock, Esq., Winslow.
*¶E. Baker, Esq., Stoneleigh, Eastern Avenue, Reading.
Hutchinson Brown, Esq., More Close, Burghfield.
A. Callas, Esq., Oxford Road, Reading.
Lord Chesham, Latimer, V.P.
*¶Lewis Cooper, Esq., Caversham, Reading.
†Sir John Conroy, Bart., Arborfield, V.P.
†Dr. Childs, Oxford.
†G. C. Cherry, Esq., Denford.
Captain Cobham, Leighton Park.
*F. J. Crapp, Esq., Castle Street, Reading.
*H. Collins, Esq., Leopold House, Reading.
Major T. Simpson Carson, Springfield, Marlow.
Lord De Mauley, Langford, V.P.
Sir H. Dashwood, Bart., Kirklington, V.P.
†Major-Gen. Desborough, C.B., Oxford.
H. Denis de Vitre, Esq., Charlton House, Wantage.
*John T. Dodd, Esq., Abbot's Walk, Reading.
W. W. M. Dewer, Esq., Cotmore House, Oxon.
Captain Dayrell, Lillingstone Dayrell.
W. S. Darter, Esq., Somerleaze, Reading.
R. C. Dryland, Esq., Reading.
*John Egginton, Esq., Reading.
*Rear-Admiral Elliot, Castle Hill House, Reading.
W. P. Farr, Esq., Mayor of Maidenhead, V.P.
†W. F. Farrer, Esq., Sandhurst Lodge.
†C. C. Ferard, Esq., Winkfield.
*Hon. J. T. Fiennes, Castle Hill, Reading.
Sir F. D. Forsyth, C.B., K.C.S.I., Upton Court, Slough.
*C. G. Field, Esq., Castle Hill, Reading.
*C. Outen-Fullbrook, Esq., Waterloo Place, Reading.
¶Francis J. Ferguson, Esq., Westbourne, Coley Avenue, Reading.
*G. Gilligan, Esq., Reading.
Col. Gray, Farley Hill.
Lieut.-Col. Harvey, St. Helen's, Sandhurst.
T. Hawkins, Esq., Oxford Road, Reading.
S. Swinfen Harris, Esq., St. Mary's, Wolverton.
E. W. Harcourt, Esq., M.P., Nuneham, V.P.
*S. Hankey, Esq., Heathlands House, Wokingham.
†Sir W. Herschel, Bart., Littlemore, V.P.
L. Duval Hall, Esq., Farnham Close, Royal.
T. T. Harrison, Esq., Mayor of Buckingham, V.P.
*Col. the Hon. W. H. Herbert, Lexden, Reading.
B. Hobbes, Esq., Poffing Hall, Witney.
†Right Hon. J. G. Hubbard, M.P., Addington Manor, Winslow, V.P.
†Egerton Hubbard, Esq., Addington.
Lieut.-Colonel Hubbard, Addington House.
I. Harrinson, Esq., Reading.
Major S. Harrison, Shelswell Park, V.P.
W. Hood, Esq., Reading.
*Sir Paul Hunter, Bart., Mortimer Hill, V.P.
*Alfred Holmes, Esq., St. Mary's Butts, Reading.
A. W. Hall, Esq., Barton Hall, Oxford.
T. Hubgood, Esq., Church Green, Witney.
A. Hill, Esq., Elm Lodge, Reading.

*J. W. Hounslow, Esq., Minster Street, Reading.
†The Earl of Jersey, Middleton Park, V.P.
Capt. Johnson, King's Mead, Windsor.
¶Capt. Kirke, R.E., Craven Road, Reading.
*Henry Knox, Esq., Sonning.
G. Lyddon, Esq., The Forbury, Reading.
Meyrick Selby Lowndes, Esq., Windsor.
W. Lyon, Esq., East Court, Finchampstead.
Sir R. Loyd-Lindsay, M.P., Lockinge, V.P.
†Colonel Makins, M.P., Rotherfield Court, V.P.
G. May, Esq., Sidmouth House, Reading.
W. G. Mount, Esq., Wasing Place.
A. Meadows, Esq., M.D., 27, George Street, Hanover Square.
W. F. Melliar, Esq., Northaston.
*John Messer, Esq., Reading.
*Joseph Morris, Esq., Springbank, Reading.
†Right Hon. Sir J. R. Mowbray, M.P., Warrennes Wood, V.P.
Berkeley Monck, Esq., Highfield, Reading.
†Herbert Morrell, Esq., Oxford.
Tonman Mosley, Esq., Bargons, Iver.
*John Miller, Esq., Southampton Street, Reading.
*John W. Martin, Esq., Downshire Square.
F. Morrell, Esq., Black Hall, Oxford.
†C. T. Murdoch, Esq., Buckhurst, Wokingham.
O. C. Maurice, Esq., Reading.
J. C. Nelson, Esq., Shaw Rectory, Newbury.
¶Lieut.-Colonel Newdigate, Beeches, Wokingham.
Colonel North, M.P., Wraxton Abbey, V.P.
J. Newham, Esq., M.D., Winslow.
*George Palmer, Esq., M.P., Acacias, Reading.
*¶G. W. Palmer, Esq., Elmhurst, Reading.
*¶Walter Palmer, Esq., Westfield, Reading.
C. B. Phillimore, Esq., Hurley Manor House, Marlow.
H. H. Phillips, Esq., M.D., Albion Place, Reading.
†James Parker, The Turl, Oxford.
†W. Phillimore, Esq., D.C.L.
*General Radcliffe, Balmore, Caversham.
†Holford C. Risley, Esq., Deddington.
Major-Gen. Romer, R.E., Reading.
T. Rogers, Esq., Landsdowne House, Reading.
†Admiral Ryder, Hambledon.
†Sir G. K. Rickards, K.C.B., Oxford.
†W. G. E. Russell, Esq., M.P, Woburn, V.P.
C. Sargent, Esq., Chilson, Enstone.
*F. G. Saunders, Esq., Caversham.
R. Sawyer, Esq., Maidenhead.
A. G. Sandeman, Esq., Moncorvo House, Ennismore Gardens, S.W.
Alfred Sutton, Esq., Greenlands, Reading.
Herbert Sutton, Esq., Reading.
*Dr. Shettle, London Street, Reading.
*¶Blackall Simonds, Esq., Mayor of Reading, V.P.
*John Simonds, Esq., Arborfield.
*James Simonds, Esq., Victoria Square.
C. J. Slocock, Esq., Newbury.
†Right Hon. W. H. Smith, M.P., Greenlands, Henley-on-Thames, V.P.
*Charles Smith, Esq., Reading.
*S. Slingsby Stallwood, Esq., Reading.
†M. C. Swabey, Esq., Langley, Slough, V.P., Chancellor of Diocese, D.C.L.
J. Savory, Esq., Buckhurst, Sunninghill, Sheriff of Middlesex.
*¶C. Stephens, Esq., Woodley Hill, Reading.
*W. H. Strickland, Esq., Russell Street, Reading.
J. O. Taylor, Esq., Cravenhurst, Reading.
Colonel Blackburn, Tew, Horton.
Major Thoyts, Sulhampstead, V.P.
John G. Talbot, Esq., M.P., Falconhurst, Eden Bridge, V.P.
R. Tomkins, Esq., Reading.
Springall Thompson, Esq., Bramcote, Slough.
J. Treadwell, Esq., Upper Winchendon, Aylesbury.
*J. C. Tirbutt, Esq., Downshire Square, Reading.
†Sir H. Verney, Bart., M.P., Claydon House, V.P.
†John Walter, Esq., M.P., Bearwood, V.P.
G. Ward, Esq., The Firs, Oxford.
†H. O. Wakeman, Esq., All Souls, Oxford.
*F. Wilder, Esq., Purley Hall, Reading.
†James Watson, Esq., Langley, Slough.
†E. Wells, Esq., M.D., Friar Street, Reading.
*†E. Wells, Esq., Wallingford.
†J. H. Wilson, Esq., Caversham.
†J. C. Wilson, Esq., Shelwood House, Oxford.
¶Captain Walter, Tangley, Wokingham.

P. Wroughton, Esq., M.P., Woolley Park, Wantage, V.P.
*W. W. Williams, Esq., London Street, Reading.
†O. P. Wethered, Esq., Great Marlow.
*M. J. Withers, Esq., Exton Lodge, Eastern Avenue, Reading.
A. Wheeler, Esq., Mayor of Oxford, V.P.
John Wheeler, Esq., Lorne Street, Reading.

SUBJECTS COMMITTEE.

CHAIRMAN—The Lord Bishop of Oxford. VICE-CHAIRMEN—The Archdeacons of Oxford, Berks., and Buckingham.
And those to whose names † is prefixed.

RECEPTION COMMITTEE.

CHAIRMAN—The Mayor of Reading (Blackall Simonds, Esq.)
VICE-CHAIRMEN—James Simonds, Esq., and F. C. Barnett, Esq.
And those to whose names * is prefixed.

BUILDING AND FINANCE COMMITTEE.

CHAIRMAN—J. Walter, Esq., M.P. VICE-CHAIRMAN—A. Hill, Esq.
HON. ARCHITECT—F. W. Albury, Esq.
And those to whose names ¶ is prefixed.

HONORARY SECRETARIES.

Rev. J. T. Brown.
Rev. J. S. Brownrigg.
Rev. G. N. Freeling.
Rev. Nicholas T. Garry.
Rev. Canon Payne.
Rev. M. Powley.
H. B. Blandy, Esq.
Professor Burrows.
Major-Gen. Desborough, C.B.
Egerton Hubbard, Esq.
James Watson, Esq.
Ed. Wells, Esq., M.D.

The Chairman, Vice-Chairmen, and Secretaries are Members (*ex-officio*) of all Committees.

CHURCH CONGRESS, 1883.

BALANCE SHEET (APPROXIMATE).

RECEIPTS.

	£	s.	d.
To Amount Received for Members' Tickets	1,366	0	5
,, Day Tickets, and Platform W. M. Meeting	292	7	6
,, Robert Tompkins, for giving up use of Land... ...	90	0	0
,, E. J. and F. Blackwell, premium for Publishing ,, "Official Guide"	5	0	0
,, Amount Received for Sale of Programmes	0	11	4
,, Ditto, ditto Clerical Directory ...	0	5	0
,, C. E. T. S., for use of Hall	6	10	0
,, G. W. R. Co., for Postage of Special Time Bills ...	3	2	8
,, Amount to be provided by Guarantors...	882	7	11
	£2,646	4	10

PAYMENTS.

	£	s.	d.
By Building and Hire of Halls, including Rent of Land, and Gas-fitting and Supply	1,954	10	6
,, Advertising	85	0	10
,, Reporting and Editing "Official Report"	105	0	0
,, Clerks, £120 10s 6d., Postage, £57 7s 2d	117	17	8
,, Printing and Stationery	154	5	3
,, Decorations	61	3	6
,, Furnishing Rooms	55	11	8
,, Miscellaneous	38	19	5
,, Interest on Overdraft at Bankers	13	16	0
	£2,646	4	10

THE SERMON

BY

HIS GRACE THE ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY,

PREACHED IN

ST. MARY'S CHURCH, READING,

ON TUESDAY, OCT. 2ND, 1883.

"And He shall stand and feed *the flock* in the strength of the Lord, in the Majesty of the name of the Lord His God; and they shall abide, for now shall He be great unto the ends of the earth, and He shall be peace."—*Micah* v. 4, 5.

THE life of man is an unveiling of things hidden but existent. Our lives and the great life of the world are a continued disclosing and manifesting of the things that are. The geometrician does not invent his most fascinating theorem. He only clears the relation of dimensions, and helps us to see what would be self-evident if our minds were more powerful. The astronomer traces movements that have been mysterious through ages and generations, and reveals the infinite star-dust which had simply been unnoticed. The biologist is but trying to unfold the petals which enclose the initial germ. The moralist is not creating a right and wrong, he is only seeking accuracy in what is known of them. Thus it stands as to knowledge.

In individual life the man (do what he will) is hourly revealing what is in him. Be he ever so reluctant to be known for what he is, he cannot dissemble for ever, and in attempting to do so he is but effectually exhibiting the thing he is. The social life of mankind is the weaving into one tissue the principles, characters, passions that belong to their place and nation. So in their political life. So in their Church life and history. All is the constant manifesting of that which is from the beginning.

But great and manifold as is this unveiling or apocalypse, evermore in process, of the things that are, fact underlying fact, law interpreting law, so that the most comprehensive laws which

are discovered to one age appear before long as only obvious consequences of freshly observed and more primitive laws—vast and marvellous as all this is, yet it is almost as nothing in comparison of the more awful unveiling which is in progress too. For above all, through all, and in all, is there not the slow unveiling of God? Are not past, present, future, the Apocalypse of the Eternal and Almighty? Recorded, steadily advancing, and prophesied of for a great while to come? What else is living Christianity than the manifestation of God in the present?

Until Christianity began, God, says the apostle, was making Himself known by many portions and in many manners. And since He began to speak to us in His Son, His manifestation is that of One who is with us all the days. But races and peoples have received, and are receiving it, according to their measure—none perfectly. "Bright and clear," says Augustine, "bright and clear are Thine answers to all, but not bright and clear is the hearing of all." And yet perhaps every group is valuing more justly than others something in the height or depth or breadth of those answers, and showing forth the power of it in a way or degree quite its own.

Yes, Christianity is, with all its lights and shades, the manifestation—the *Phanerósis*, if I may remind you of St. Paul's frequent expression of what I speak of—the *Phanerósis* of God.

A creature so excellent as man must be excellent towards some end. And God must desire to see the end attained; and a conscious being, formed to be so conscious and so eager about all relations that concern him, cannot adequately attain his end without some consciousness of his relations towards God.

We remember in how many noble passages St. Paul speaks of God as making men conscious of these relations to Himself in order to working out their end (whatever it be) rationally. Recollect how he tells of "That which is knowable of God being manifest" in the ancients, "because God made it manifest" through nature, namely, "His eternal power and divinity"—and how he tells of that life, higher than the life of nature, "The life that is in Christ" being meant "to be manifested in our body," our corporeal life; and of a yet future and still greater "manifesting of Christ as our life" when "we ourselves shall be manifested" also, he says, and when that higher self within, of which all men at times feel the yearning and the stirring, yet are often so unable to realise it, shall be *brought out*, as it were, and have full scope and be at liberty.

As we recall again how simply Christ spoke at the last of His own unspeakable work having been just this—"I manifested Thy name unto the men," we cannot think without awe of the depths which lie unplumbed beneath so plain a word. And accordingly we are able to follow St. Paul when he dwells on "the mystery that had been kept in silence, from ages and

generations, but now was manifested," or upon "the grace" virtually "given to us ages back" (like all other that we call forces in nature), and "lately made manifest"—its energy just emerging in us; or when he observes that it was only "at appropriate crises that God manifested His Word," or when he asks for the help of his Church's prayers to do his own part in manifesting it. Nor he alone, but each author in the New Testament, speaks of this manifesting of God to the heart and conscience of men, as the one true way in which they may be raised, and rise, and raise each other. To know God Himself, not merely to know what men have said, or are said to have said about Him, but to know *Him* and to love *Him*, is made possible for all, and is the help of all when help is most needed. To live the life of those who knew and loved such an One is the supreme call now to His Church, and the one way in which she can vindicate her mission. For if we live such a life, the bodies of men and their work-day lives will be dear to us even because their souls are dear, and we shall enter compassionately into their poverty, pain, and ignorance, because it is through us, so dealing at this present, that God can shine into their streets and rooms and hearts.

And, now, if we believe this—if we believe that Christianity is the final manifesting of God that this earth will have; if we add to this faith what must be the faith of a Christian, that other beings, other spheres of being, are concerned in watching the manifestation of God which is going on here, and that a yet higher *Phanerósis* of Him to some who are far above mortality is being made through His ways with us and our answering ways with Him—if we believe "that unto the principalities and powers in heavenly places is being made known through the Church the manifold wisdom of God"—then we rise to comprehend the supreme importance of the conduct of the Church in every crisis that occurs to her, of her solution of each problem as it presents itself, of her careful day to day administration, of her firm yet loving tone in every society and church and school and home that is called by her name.

And let me here say, in passing, one word of comfort: if we believe Christianity to be God's own manifestation of God, and to have its office in worlds eternal and invisible as well as here, then how shall any one of us for an hour fear the darkening or obscuration of it, still more deem it conceivable that anything else should ever take its place in the heart of man? Not the faith, but our unfaithfulness to the faith; not the manifestation, but the shadows which our selfishness casts on it; not the kingdom, but our imperfect administration of it, may need from time to time "a loving correction to make us great," but we shall never be parted from it, nor it from us—never.

And to resume. If we believe the facts in their awfulness

and their nearness, in their mystery and their plainness, we can understand what, as readers, we may have perceived (and that perhaps with a sense of flatness or anti-climax, if we did not see the point of it), we may have perceived, I say, that whenever, in loftiest diction and in almost unattainable conceptions, the apostles speak of the endless mystery of God's revealing Himself, the Incommunicable, they invariably pass on at once to speak in homeliest phrase and simplest tone of the immediate duty of preaching, speaking, talking and telling to every soul the facts and the obvious inferences from them. We cannot now dwell on their language. Any one may mark for himself that these two, the faith and the duty, the mystery and the matter of fact, are in their view inseparable; they will not admit that any human creature may be assumed to be unreceptive of the truth, if rightly approached; they do not hold that the Church in its members or in its assemblies has any duty lying outside of this, or that it is to be guided by any other light than this—the making God Himself to be known.

Now what conditions are here involved on our part? Plainly two. That we must be at Unity among ourselves. And that we must understand that there is no function, no region of life or thought, which it is not the Church's duty to occupy. For her, disunion is the death of action. And for her, nothing is secular but what is sinful. The early Church knew not the word in any other sense. Whatever good man knows or can do, the Church can do it or help him to do it better. No hindrances can be insuperable. When she began her work the whole world was her hindrance; when she ends it, the mountain will have become a plain. Mark the centuries of Church advance till now. First she had a universal Idolatry to overcome, and overcame it. Then the countless tribes which broke up the old civilisations were governed by an absolute Naturalism in feeling and in action, and she overcame it. Then arose Despotisms, great and small, which claimed the entire disposal of persons, lands and goods. The Church grappled with them in every detail. National Freedom began. Then drew on the battle of thought in the Church against Formalism. For, alas, in these two later stages things went near to her own corruption and overthrow. For Cæsarism and Formalism had allied themselves to her, and when her own freedom overcame *them*, she was half swept down with them—yet she recovers and overcomes by suffering.

And why, why was this pause in her career? this nearness to overthrow? Why has it gone so hard with the Church of Europe? Alas! the answer is plain. It had become possible in France to distinguish between the Church and the clergy. It was possible to declare that the Church was an ideal no longer realised or attempted; that she had ceased to be an

actuality ; that a selfish clergy, a worldly clergy, were her only heirs and representatives. It was possible too to distinguish among the clergy themselves : to discern among them a few of earth's purest saints, but to think them saints in spite of their order. Their order rendered their saintliness incredible to the masses.

And now, so many and so mighty world-spirits overcome, or at least not victorious ; what is the world-spirit of the nineteenth century against which the Church has again to contend? Ages ago she heard how spirit after spirit should arise to contest her work. Who rises now? And what is the aspect under which she will meet him? I would answer these two questions in words borrowed from the most sober of Churchmen, and from an eminent French theist and statesman of the present. Let Dr. Hook tell us what the Church must realise as her course of to-day. "The Reformation," he writes, "was not completed. There was a pause in its progress. But we have lived to see this reformation, which was begun in the sixteenth century, about to be resumed in the nineteenth."*

Memorable forecast of so passionate a lover of the Church. The work real. The contest severe. The ingathering of souls magnificent. The first-fruits to be redeemed from them who block our reform only that they may accuse and sentence us. Like the men who compassed that young Dauphin with corruption, that they might have the delight of condemning him for corruption. Yes : there is a new captivity to lead captive.

But who, once more, is that spirit against whom her fast coming strength must measure itself? Let Jules Simon tell us this :— "One day they will say of the nineteenth century that it was a struggle for the mastery between Spiritualism and Nihilism."† Between Spiritualism and Nihilism! Have we realised that? And do we believe that the truest representative on earth of a spiritual kingdom able to render and to vivify, to erect and defend spiritual truth in forms visible, intelligible, and maintainable among the social and reasonable forms of the world is the Church of our land, and her vast spiritual offspring? And do her clergy and her laity recognise that there is not a parish or a village, scarce a family, within whose circles there is no anxiety afoot? And that there is not one careless ease-loving champion or watchman who is not betraying us?

Look at our modern history and see whither it has led us. Till lately there had not been a half-century in which the Church had not, by some signal act or example, uttered some strong warning voice that men should earnestly use this world and its

---

* *Life of Parker. Archbishops of Canterbury, vol. IV., p.* 588.
† *Dieu, Patrie, Liberté, p.* 27.

forces, but not abuse them. How lasting and how determined was her resolution to reform herself, and yet to be herself. How long the effort was continued and how effectually, after near two centuries of preparation, at last under one king she shook off the old cramping tyranny; under the next she explored her extreme paths of continental demolition and saw whither they were leading, and the nation itself turned back from them. Under the next queen she tried once more whether there could be any peace with Rome, and yet a Reform. Her ecclesiastical head was a Lutheran in the *articulus stantis aut cadentis ecclesiae.* He was a victim of the Italian Inquisition. He confirmed the sacrifice of the whole monastic system, even to the spoliation of the Abbey, which was your own and England's pride, and of all her sisters. Such was Archbishop Pole. And for all that the reign reads like a dream of insanity and death. That experiment of Roman Unity was so tried once and for all. The next reign saw the restoration of those constitutional principles of the Church of God, which we shall not alter, but which we shall develop and enlarge and purify while England stands; never hesitating to recognise changes in conditions, intellectual, social, or political, never fearing but that it *is* in the Church by her original gifts to meet and to bless them, and be still ever herself. England and the Church of England have become a greatness since then of which that old greatness was but a type, and our dangers have grown in proportion.

Do not then let us deceive ourselves into thinking that either the complications or the remedies of which we have been hearing so much in the last few years constitute our real vocation, or must engross our cares in these days. They are needful, but they are only side works. They are but questionings upon the old small scale, touching the old small routine—and Remedies, however suitable, are not offered to the Church as a philosophy or a complete policy in themselves. They are simply a better *modus vivendi,* which, if accepted, will carry us over a crisis. But how shortly ought all such things to be despatched or surrendered if we consider that the real work of the Church is the *Phanerósis* of the Great God and Saviour. For if we seriously think that our usages *are* that *Phanerósis*, we must be under some strange spell. The really great, the anxious, the terrible problems are the claim of the poor, the claim of the ignorant, the claim of the child upon the Church. These claims, if unconsidered and unsatisfied, will deal more hardly with us than with the Gallican Church. Yet that is not the question. We speak of "claims" as if they were to be examined presently by an accountant, and discounted perhaps before being paid. The case is far otherwise. The English coast is strewn with "social wreckage," due far less to the hurricane of the world, pitiless as it is, than to the unseaworthy craft

the drunken crews, the unstudied chart, the unlighted shores. The appeal lies not to fear, but to our love, to our power, to our sound minds. No power but that of the Church acting from below the pressure will inaugurate the solution of these problems. When she has initiated the solution, the State will step in and take up the work and the honour, and remove the divine core of it, as it has done in other things. Yet even that is not the question either.

Ignorance and orphanhood trained in vice do not grow up helpless. They are armed for the ruin of commonwealths. But no commonwealth ever yet saved *itself* from such ruin. Civic fear is not motive strong enough to avert it in time. There is no Saviour but Christ in His Church. Utterly apart from all such fears is the true vision of the Church. Her work is *Phanerósis.* The text over her portals is—"When He saw the multitudes He had compassion on them." And its altar-piece is Christ standing over a kneeling form—"Lovest thou Me? Shepherd My sheep. Feed My lambs. Feed My sheep." The primal charge. But its execution, even by that eager spirit of work which is blessedly begun in us, is simply hopeless, save on two conditions, of which our store is small. Peace, peace with one another. Minds open to all truth.

How obvious and easy it sounds. But there is the snare. We are apt to expect that because unity is peaceful when it is won, therefore the winning of it should be smooth and delightful. Not so. Unity can only be attained by clenched determination, unflinching toil, and sacrifice; by surrendering prejudices which are dearer than principles; by holding fast principles which are loss to us and folly to the world.

The unity of any single country of Europe has been achieved only at all but infinite cost. Can the unity of a Church cost less?

We are her citizens, but we are her soldiers, and—

> "Do we think
> The day of our discharge will find us whole,
> And young, and ready for this life's reward?"

We must indeed banish that wilful jealous zeal, which, however effective for immediate purposes, is, as Cyprian says, the ruin of peacemaking and of all Church affection. Yet without devotion, without suffering, unity is no more attainable than any lower end.

For the present moment:—The Congress has hitherto served to extend and deepen the sense of unity in the Church. May this one excel. A synod was looked on of old as a consummate act of worship. So should a congress be. The peace of God and His Church should brood over hearts and minds in the most eager discussion. The threshold of the Roman Senate-house was so appointed that every senator as he entered pressed his

right foot for an instant on the symbol of concord—the battling serpents twined into harmony round the Divine wand.

It was a noble and a gentle reminder to each of the spirit in which a Roman was to debate his country's weal with those who differed most from him.

May the Churchman's mightier token, sign of suffering and love divine, bring to every heart that peace in which *all* things are to be reconciled by that sign at the last, whether they be things in heaven, or things in earth, or things under the earth :—

> "So shall our Shepherd stand and feed His flock,
> And they shall abide,
> For now shall He be great,
> And He shall be peace."

THE SERMON

BY

THE LORD BISHOP OF WINCHESTER,

PREACHED IN

ST. LAWRENCE'S CHURCH, READING,

ON TUESDAY, OCT. 2ND, 1883.

"And now ye know what withholdeth that he might be revealed in his time. For the mystery of iniquity doth already work: only he who now letteth will let, until he be taken out of the way."—2 *Thess.* ii. 6, 7.

WE learn from Holy Scripture and from the earliest fathers that an ancient and general expectation prevailed in the Church of a great person, power, or principle of evil and of error, to arise before the final coming of our Lord, which should be so antagonistic to truth and to Christ as to aim at rooting out all faith in Christ and in God, denying both the Father and the Son, sitting in the Temple of God and claiming to be God.

It is held by some, not without good ground of argument, that the Apostles St. Paul and St. John speak of what was generally accepted as a prophetic anticipation rather than of any special revelation made direct from heaven to themselves. St. John says—"Ye have heard that Antichrist shall come" (1 John ii. 18). St. Paul says—"That day shall not come except the falling away come first, and the man of sin (or perhaps of 'lawlessness') be revealed" (2 Thess. ii. 3). There was a known apostasy (ἡ ἀποστασία), an expected "man of sin" (ὁ ἄνομος), "the lawless one." Some think the prophecies of Daniel concerning the little horn which had eyes like a man, and a mouth speaking great things, which made war with the saints and prevailed against them, but which was brought into judgment when the thrones were cast down and the Ancient of Days did sit, and One like the Son of Man was brought near before Him, Who

received dominion and glory and a kingdom that all men should serve Him—some, I say, think that these prophecies studied by the primitive believers led to that expectation, general in the Church, of a great rival power to the Saviour, cruel and persecuting, whose rise should shortly precede the last judgment of the great day. It may have been so; or it may have been that some words of our Lord Himself had forewarned of a great apostasy and a fierce antagonism to the truth; or it may have been that that Spirit of prophecy, which still abode with the Church, though the great Teacher and Prophet was gone away into heaven, had spoken by the mouths of the prophets, and their speech had gone out into all lands. The uncertainty as to how the prophecy came adds somewhat to the obscurity of the prophecy itself. Yet, if we look carefully and apart from prejudice at St. Paul's words in the Thessalonians and St. John's in his first epistle, the only apostles who certainly speak of this, we shall find the distinctive characters of the apostasy plainly marked out.

It may perhaps, be hard to say whether the Antichrist is to be a single person, as the Fathers mostly believed; or a succession of persons, like a regal, imperial, or papal dynasty, as many later writers have thought; or a prevailing principle of sin and error, as has been the belief of not a few in these our own days. If we took St. Paul's words only, we should perhaps conclude that the "man of sin" was a single human being. If we took St. John's only, we should rather infer that Antichrist was a great heresy, characterised chiefly by denying the Incarnation (that "Jesus Christ had come in the flesh"), nay, even denying both "the Father and the Son" (1 John ii. 22; iv. 3). It may be wise not definitely to assume either the one or the other of these rival opinions. If a person was predicted, it is clearly such a person as would embody in himself and impose upon others a principle of monstrous error. If a principle is meant, it must be a principle embraced by many, carried out in action by those embracing it, and very probably having some one more prominent teacher, leading others into it, and diffusing wide its poisonous pestilence.

But though there be a difficulty of this kind as to the personality, it is not difficult to conclude what shall be the nature of the error. St. John, as I have reminded you, says that Antichrist shall "deny both the Father and the Son," and specially shall deny that "Jesus Christ has come in the flesh;" and also that whereas it was known that Antichrist should come, even then there were "many Antichrists." St. Paul adds further notes. It shall not be some external power breaking in upon the Church and desolating it, like a heathen or an imperial tyranny; but it shall either follow or coincide with a great "apostasy." There shall be a falling away—nay, "the falling away." It must

evidently arise in the heart of Christendom, from the bosom of the Church of Christ. Its special character shall be lawlessness. As St. John says that it shall reject God and Christ, so St. Paul tells us that it shall reject law as well as religion. "The man of sin" is in many ancient MSS. "the man of lawlessness" (2 Thess. ii. 4); and, at all events, he is once expressly called the "lawless one" (2 Thess. ii. 8), and his principle is "the mystery of lawlessness" (v. 7). He dashes down all worship, opposing himself "to all that is called God or that is worshipped;" not, as St. Chrysostom notes, seducing into idolatry or setting up a false religion, but destroying all religion and abolishing all gods (Chrys. *Hom.* ii. *in Thess.* ii.), offering only himself as the object of worship, sitting in the temple of God—*i.e.*, not, as the same Father adds, in the Temple of Jerusalem, but in (or against) all Churches everywhere (εἰς τὰς πανταχοῦ ἐκκλησίας); "setting forth only himself as God" (2 Thess. ii. 4, Revised Version).

The mystery of lawlessness was already working; but at length there shall be revealed "the lawless one," and his coming shall be "according to the working of Satan with all power and signs and lying wonders, and with all deceit of unrighteousness for them that are perishing, because they received not the love of the truth that they might be saved" (2 Thess. ii. 9, 10).

The picture is clear, vivid, and strong. A great apostasy from Christian faith, an open denial of the great Christian mysteries of the Incarnation, of the Father, of the Son, nay, even of God and of all that is worshipped; a spirit, or an embodiment of the spirit of lawlessness, with apparent demonstration by signs and wonders; an effort to stamp out and root out all religion, substituting the worship of Antichrist for the worship of God.

1. It has been suggested that Nero answered in all particulars to this picture. Yet he was not an apostate, nor did his reign of terror and lust and cruelty succeed to a great "falling away," or even create one. Nay! the blood of his martyrs was the seed of the Church. He was altogether external to the Church, not an apostate from it; and St. Chrysostom has wisely said that he was not himself Antichrist, but rather a type of Antichrist—*i.e.*, of the Antichrist, which was yet for to come.

2. The Gnostic heretics may have been, as St. John seems to say, some of the "many Antichrists;" their belief in God being Pantheism rather than Theism, and their Christ not "God manifest in the flesh," not God made man, but truly neither God nor man. Yet they lacked many of the specified characteristics. They were not so much persecutors as the victims of persecution. They claimed no divine worship for themselves. They were no true apostates from the Christian

faith, but rather heathen philosophers engrafting a portion of Christianity on their own old philosophic systems.

3. Mahommed might put in a better claim to be the expected Antichrist; but he also was wholly from without. He was no apostate from the faith of Christ, but rather one who converted his heathen fellow-countrymen to a faith nearer to Christianity, though still far from it. He swept away polytheism and idolatry, and set up the worship of the God of Abraham; founding a religion which may perhaps be called a heresy of Christianity or of Judaism; but which was in no sense a falling away from, being rather an approximation to, the religion of the Son of God.

4. There remains that great principle called Romanism, that great succession of men known to us as the Papacy, which has not unnaturally been thought to have upon it many of the marks by which St. Paul has described the coming Antichrist. The power exerted by it over the consciences of men, the claims to infallibility and to universal dominion, attributes of none but God, the stifling of all attempts at reformation, the persecution and cruelty exercised on all that opposed themselves, the addition of unsound articles to the creeds of Christendom, and of superstitious practices to the worship of Christendom; these and the like naturally led men, in the life struggle of the sixteenth century, to identify the Pope with Antichrist, who, as Luther has said, was not to sit in low and vile places, on "dunghills or in pigstyes," but to be enthroned in "the Temple of God."

But will the teaching of the apostles, the word of Holy Scripture, lend itself to this belief? Can Romanism be properly called an apostasy from the Church? Was it not more truly a gradual corruption from within of the Church itself, of its doctrine and its practices, rather than a falling away of any single portion of it? It is true that Roman accretions to the faith have obscured and overlaid some of its most vital principles. The latest of those accretions—the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception—is perilously near to a heresy on the Incarnation: separating as it does by an intervening link the sinless Manhood of Christ from the mass of sin-stricken humanity; making it needful to have a mediatrix between us and the One Mediator—the Man Christ Jesus. But can it truly be said that the Papacy has denied that Jesus Christ has come in the flesh, or that it has denied the Father and the Son? On the doctrines of the Trinity and the Incarnation it has been uniformly and conspicuously sound. It may have exalted itself "above all law;" but can it be correctly called "the lawless," "the lawless one"? or can its principles be accounted as the "mystery of lawlessness"? Tyranny, the exacting of unfaltering obedience, the binding down to the straitest uniformity, the forging of new fetters for men's hearts and consciences, the avenging of the slightest departure from approved opinions or practices—these,

not lawlessness or anarchy, have ever characterised the actions of the See of Rome from the beginning until now. Rightly may Gregory the Great have said that whoso claims an universal Episcopate is the forerunner of the Antichrist, because usurpation and tyranny lead by inevitable reaction to anarchy and lawlessness. Well, therefore, may we believe the over-law of the Papacy to be the forerunner of the un-law of Antichrist. But, so far as we can read, the full manifestation of that fearful power is yet to be seen. Come when Antichrist may, if he fulfils the predictions of the apostles; his belief will be atheism, his rule anarchy, and his law licence.

Why has he delayed his coming? Is the charge lately made against the apostles true, that they were harmless Galilean peasants, who indulged in prophecies, which have never been fulfilled?

St. Paul had said that there was in his day a hindrance, one "that letteth," one that restraineth, "until he be taken out of the way." There was a traditional belief in the early Church, which has been very generally accepted in later times, that this restraining power was the great fabric of the Empire of Rome. St. Chrysostom tells us that another restraint had been suggested in his day—viz., the presence of the Holy Spirit in the Church. But we can hardly think that that presence, when most needed, should ever "be taken out of the way," a presence which Christ had promised "to abide with" His disciples "for ever" (John xiv. 16). St. Chrysostom therefore justly concludes that the restraining power is, as was generally believed, the Roman Empire; that as the Median Empire was destroyed by Babylon, the Babylonian by Persia, the Persian by the Macedonian, the Macedonion by Rome, so the Roman should be destroyed by Antichrist, and Antichrist by Christ (*Hom.* iv. *in Thess.* Tom. xi., p. 529). St. Cyril of Jerusalem (*Catech. Illum.* xv.) had said very much the same before. "This predicted Antichrist shall come when the times of the Roman Empire are fulfilled and the end of the world is at hand."

Shall we ask again, why has Antichrist delayed his coming? Has the Roman Empire gone, and still the great apostasy is deferred? What was that Roman Empire, which hindered, which was letting and which should let, till it were taken out of the way? Did it mean individual Princes—a Nero, a Domitian, a Diocletian, even a Constantine, or a Justinian? Some of them seemed more like Antichrist than restrainers of Antichrist; and the best of them were as like to oppressors as to restrainers of oppression. Under many of them the great anti-Christian error of Arius was fostered, and under their influence the Eastern world—nay! St. Jerome says, "The whole world groaned and wondered to find itself Arian." At first, it is true, the Christians were shielded against Jewish persecutors and popular tumults by

the law-loving and religiously indifferent rulers of the Empire. But Nero soon dispelled the illusion ; and, though Christians never ceased to "honour the King," they dearly learned to "put no trust in Princes."

It was not the Roman Emperor, but the Roman Empire, which restrained the predicted apostasy, the great lawlessness and unbelief, to which all Christian ages have looked forward with awe. The system of law, which had its origin in the Roman Republic, which developed in the Roman Empire, and which was finally stamped, sealed, and codified in the Christian Empire, may well have been esteemed a power able to restrain lawlessness of life, and even atheism in religion. Nothing like it was ever known in the times of old ; and it has interpenetrated, moulded, and fashioned all government and all social life from old times until now.

When the Emperors became Christian, and the Church was in close alliance with the Empire, they acted and reacted on each other. The law of the Church was enforced by the law of the Empire, and the law of the Empire was sanctified and softened by the law of the Church. So into every country which the Church reached and converted, the clergy carried with them imperial laws and imperial organisations. Every Christian country, especially in Western Europe, received along with its Christianity the impress, the image and superscription, of the Empire of Rome. The impress was that of strict law sanctioned by national religion. Most of those I speak to will remember that the supreme power in Rome was religious from the first. King of men, and priest of God, *Rex hominum divômque Sacerdos*, was the natural union of offices. The Cæsars assumed the title of Supreme Pontiff, that they might fulfil the conditions of supreme ruler. When Constantine submitted his crown to the cross, he still proclaimed himself Bishop of the Church without, as the successors of the Apostles were Bishops of the Church within. If we look down through all the course of European history, we shall find every country imbued with the spirit of ancient Rome, bending ever to law, and mingling religion with civil government. Roman law was taught in all the Universities of Europe, and principles derived from Roman law ruled in the courts and guided the decisions of the Judges. Nay! not so only, but till this very century the belief existed that the Roman Empire was still the chief authority in the social condition of the Western world. A very eminent historian writes—

It may seem a hard saying, but it is one which facts fully bear out, that hardly one student in ten of mediæval history really grasps that one key to the whole subject, without which mediæval history is simply an unintelligible chaos. That key is no other than the continued existence of the Roman Empire. As long as people are taught to believe that the Empire came to an end in the year 476, a true understanding of the next thousand years becomes utterly impossible. No man can understand

either the politics or the literature of that whole period, unless he constantly bears in mind that, in the ideas of those days, the Roman Empire, the Empire of Augustus, Constantine, and Justinian, was not a thing of the past, but a thing of the present.—(E. A. Freeman, "Historical Essays," First Series, Essay VI., *The Holy Roman Empire.)*

We all know that Charles the Great in the year 800 was crowned Emperor of Rome, that the Emperors in Germany were acknowledged to be the successors of Charles and so of Augustus, and that though in 1806 the Holy Roman Empire was dissolved, yet Napoleon still claimed to be the representative of the Emperors of the West, and still called his son "the King of Rome." Even in title, therefore, the Roman Empire lasted till the nineteenth century, and its principles of law, and of law combined with religion, were in force at all events to the period of the French Revolution.

That which let or restrained the manifestation of Antichrist had not then, probably it has not yet, been "taken out of the way." Now, indeed, its iron strength is yielding; and "the iron seems mingled with the clay." The law and the principle of strong government, and of religion united with government, still have their hold in the Christendom of this present century; but we cannot doubt that for good or for evil, change is at work in all. The fabric is rapidly loosening. Constitutional is fast supplanting imperial government, for which we may be thankful; but, beneath all government, and waiting to subvert and submerge all, lie hidden, or scarcely hidden, volcanic fires of communistic anarchy, joined in close affinity with agnosticism and atheism. Nearly every nation in Europe, even the least influenced by communistic principles, is threatening to throw off its national faith. It would be no great prodigy if those who witness the birth of the twentieth century after Christ were to see it bereft of that power of social order and of iron law tempered by Christian faith, which has come down to us through nineteen centuries, from Augustus, in whose reign the Christ was born, through Constantine and Justinian and Charles the Great, and of which even Napoleon coveted the inheritance. That which letteth is apparently in the process of being "taken out of the way;" and a spirit is growing up, silently gaining strength and ascendancy, which has well-nigh every characteristic of St. Paul's Man of sin and of St. John's Antichrist.

There have been many great crises in history, in which men have looked out for the development of Antichrist and for the signs of Christ's coming; and this may be but one of them. Far be it from us in our day to decide that ours is the final crisis, before the great consummation; but that we are in a crisis almost all can see. The conflict between law and unlaw, between Christianity and irreligion, between theism and atheism, is more manifest and undisguised, especially in Continental Europe, than it has been for centuries, perhaps than it has ever been. It is

unwise to exaggerate the danger ; but it is folly to disguise it. There is very much on the opposite side that is hopeful, and the danger may pass away. But to be forewarned is to be forearmed. There is, I say, much that is hopeful. The very progress of anarchy and of anti-Christian error has roused in opposition to it zeal for faith and truth. But so all seems only the more to betoken and to usher in a struggle of no common severity. There is no reason to conclude from the writings of the apostles that even when Antichrist shall come, the Church will fail before the great apostasy, the spirit of lawlessness and unbelief. What we naturally conclude is, that the Church will lose very many of its less devoted members ; that it will be more narrowed and more sharply defined. There is to be a falling away, and a development of error and unbelief, accompanied, and in part produced, by signs and lying wonders and all deceit of unrighteousness in them that are perishing from want of love to the truth (2 Thess. ii. 9, 10). I do not think it does violence to this language to believe, that the signs and wonders may be the miracles of science and art and learning, worked up in an unbelieving spirit, and turned against the faith of Christ and even against belief in God. The result will be (may we not say the result is?) that many brought up in the Christian Church will be led to fall away from it, not having received the truth in the love of it, that nations will cease to acknowledge the supremacy of the kingdom of Christ, agreeing to consult and legislate only for things material and temporal, and letting Churches and sects do what they can for things spiritual and eternal, if indeed, there be things spiritual and there be any eternity. There will probably no longer be any fitness in saying that the kingdoms of this world have become the kingdoms of our God and of His Christ. The kingdom of Christ will be again isolated and contracted, shorn of its earthly glories, but not lacking the glory of the King's presence, or of His Spirit's grace. The boundary line between the Church and the world will be more clearly drawn and more sharply cut. Men will have to choose their sides, and perhaps to suffer for choosing them. On the other hand, if nations cease to protect the faith, they will have less power to corrupt it. Every one born in the bosom of a Christian nation will not be baptized and trained upward as a Christian soul ; and so the face of society will be less purified by being professedly Christian society ; but those who choose to follow Christ will do so with a will—a will strengthened by having to endure hardness, and perhaps to encounter contempt and persecution. This seems to be the outlook when Antichrist shall come. Is it very unlike the apparent outlook for our own or for our children's age ?

Whether the great struggle is at hand or only one of many great struggles ; whether the Antichrist is coming, or only a type

of Antichrist; we cannot question that we are already in a condition of thought and of society, in which everything will be, in which everything already is, upon its trial. Nations are on their trial, Churches are on their trial, Faith is on its trial, the Faith itself is on its trial, as once He was whose faith it is. We can have no misgivings for the Faith. It is assailed by the multitude with swords and with staves, sold by false followers, brought into the judgment-hall; hopes may be trembling and hearts failing; lips that once were bold in confession may be betrayed into denying; but the day will never be darker than that day was when Judas sold his Master, when Peter durst not own Him, when all the disciples forsook Him and fled, when the chief priests triumphed over Him and the Governor condemned Him, when it was their "hour and the power of darkness." It shall never be so dark again; and behind the darkness the resurrection light will be ever gleaming. But every crisis must be critical; and we do well to be ready for it. In such seasons sandy foundations fail; half finished edifices are soon thrown over; those half attached to the Rock are readily rent away from It.

Where are we ourselves anchored, and how? Try the head first, and then the heart. Is the whole head sound, and the whole heart true? Is our belief a mere languid quiescence, hard by indifference, readily gliding into doubt? Or is our faith a "love of the truth"—a receiving of the "truth in the love of it?"

Is our life a life of watching? and has it been a life of communing with God in prayer and heavenly converse, seeking Him through the darkness, and struggling upward to His light? And may it so be said of us, "He that believeth hath the witness in himself"—witness from inner consciousness and outward experience—witness that, to supply our wants, to guide our steps, to comfort our hearts, God is true, God is present, God is love. Such love of the truth, and such witness of the truth to the soul, can be our only security, "when the foundations are cast down," and when men are asking, "What hath the righteous done?" and, perhaps, Where are the righteous gone?

But, besides ourselves, we have a great call to be stirring and to be watching for our Christian homes and for the Church of God. Whatever crisis be at hand, even if it be the great, long-looked-for Antichrist, there may be brighter spots in the spreading darkness, islands of light in the swelling sea of doubt and disbelief. May we still cherish a hope that England may be one of these? God's providence has kept us from many evils round us in times past. Sea-girt, we may have but later learned the good; but we have also been longer guarded from the ill. Shall it be so hereafter? and can we help to give a hopeful answer to the inquiry? And most surely, if we can, we must. Is it nothing to us because we are Christians, that we are also Englishmen?

Is the home of our childhood and the home of our own children no longer the home of our hearts? And shall we not watch and pray and work to keep it from the evil, and to secure it under the care of God and in the faith of Christ? Politicians we ought not to be, but Christians patriots we may be. Abraham pleaded even for Sodom, and Christ wept for Jerusalem.

Possibly we have sometimes thought that it matters little what comes to our land, so our Church be sure. If the ark floats well aloft, and the souls within it be saved; let the waters prevail upon the earth, even though "all flesh die," "all in whose nostrils is the breath of life." And we have let loose the floodgates of strife and discord, not regarding the offence done to Christ's little ones, even though thus the weak brothers perish for whom Christ died. Can any of us, can any party or school, can many single Christians, say that they are not verily guilty in this?

At all events Churchmen can watch for the Church, and try to settle it firmly and strongly before the rain shall descend and the floods shall come and the winds shall blow and beat upon that house.

This Church of ours has surely a great part to play in the coming conflict, be it what it may. Even aliens from its bosom have confessed that it is fitted to fight in the front. Very ill would it become us, in the forecast of danger, to speak boastfully. Rather let us say, We have sinned with our fathers. Rather let us look around and acknowledge that others have worked when we had folded our hands to sleep; let us confess that, whilst God has secured to us the richest inheritance, others in more sterile soils, or soils half-choked with briars, have sometimes brought better fruit to perfection. But let us not doubt our blessings, nor be careless of retaining them. It is a time to look to our foundations, to make sure our defences, to recruit our garrison, and to unite our forces. Our foundations lie deep in Scripture truth and apostolic discipline. Unless we keep both firm, the shock may come upon us before we are armed to resist it. Will it not be our wisdom to make strong, clear, and definite the great root principles of the faith of Christ, to keep safe the Church order of the primitive ages, and then to give fair scope and large latitude to all beside? We cannot build but on a deep basis; but we want breadth too, as well as unity, if we are to bring many souls to Christ, and keep them as His soldiers and subjects. Let us be sure that we are built on apostles and prophets, and that the corner-stone is Christ; but let us then cut away all that is needless, and not shake rudely those who would adhere to us if we will receive them, but who will not be received to doubtful disputations. Whilst all has gone smooth with us, have we not been self-willed and petulant? Impatient of control and impatient of opposition, we have pressed on changes against the prejudices of our brethren, or else resisted changes which might have been

helpful. We have not feared to cause divisions, or to drive others to cause them; to refuse even the truth itself, if it does not wear our own livery. If we are to meet all that is awaiting us, we must cease from this, and from the strife which comes with it. If the danger, nay, if the actual presence of the evil brings to us reflection and forbearance and humility and charity; the very coming of Antichrist may only hasten the triumph of Christ. Neither nations nor Churches are the better for unbroken prosperity. Long times of peace are known to make nations luxurious and effeminate. Long times of serenity make Churches and Christians forgetful of their watchfulness, and cold in their love. There are many outward glories in the Church's inheritance which we must not undervalue, which we should strive earnestly to retain. But these are not her abiding glories. "Now abideth faith, hope, and charity." These can abide the trial, be it what it may. Like the stream which waters Paradise, they flow from the throne of God; and no power on earth or under the earth can damage or dim them.

And if the thoughts which I have suggested to-day seem serious and sad; let us remember that the sadness is but transitory, and that there is joy behind the shadow. The predicted triumph of the Antichrist, and of every type of the Antichrist, is but the prelude to the greater, to the final victory of Christ our King. Antichrist is to be consumed by the word of His mouth and destroyed by the brightness of His presence; and He is to reign for ever. Of this there can be no question; but the question is, Shall our homes, our Church, our hearts, be sharers of His victory, and partakers of His Kingdom? "Shall we be accounted worthy to escape all these things which shall come to pass, and to stand before the Son of Man?" (Luke xxi. 36).

THE SERMON

BY

THE LORD BISHOP OF MEATH,

PREACHED IN

ST. GILES' CHURCH, READING,

ON TUESDAY, OCT. 2ND, 1883.

"That they may be one."—*John* xvii. 22.

THE heart of man instinctively longs for perfection. The clouds of ignorance, impurity, and disunion which darken our fallen world are pierced by this one bright gleam at least. We all crave after an ideal of perfect truth, perfect holiness, perfect unity. Nay, more—which of us is not conscious of "a still, small voice" within, speaking to us as one that hath authority, and teaching us that perfection is the state for which we were originally intended, the standard up to which we ought now to aspire, the goal which we may hope, at the last, to reach!

To the thoughtful mind there is, perhaps, no surer earnest of a life beyond the grave, no stronger proof of a God of holiness and love on high, than this intuitive conviction that we were, and are, meant for better things than this life provides. Such an assurance whispers to us of heaven. It speaks to us of a heavenly origin in the past, of heavenly duties in the present, of a heavenly destiny in the future. It tells us, in other words, of a God to whom we owe our being, whom we are now bound to serve, and with whom we may hope to dwell hereafter!

And yet it is equally true that this very craving after perfection, if not controlled by the grace of patience, may become an impulse full of peril. Nay, as a matter of fact, it has been in every age the cause of innumerable dangers and disasters, both to Christians individually and to the Catholic Church at large.

Let me cite a few instances from among many.

Man, as I have said, longs for perfect truth. He somehow feels that he *ought* to see all things clearly, and to know everything with absolute certainty. The ideal, in fact, of his destiny seems incomplete without such perfect knowledge. And yet, if such a yearning for things that *ought to be*—however good that yearning may be in itself—is not tempered by a submissive recognition of things as they *are*, and a patient waiting for things as they *will be* by-and-bye, what will be the result? Simply this: Man will either presume or he will despair!

How rash, for example, are the preconceptions which, in our impatience, we sometimes form as to that most precious of all God's gifts—next to the gift of His own dear Son—THE BIBLE. "If God," we are tempted at times to say, "has indeed given us a revelation in the Bible, that Book ought to present in all its parts the perfect image of God's own perfection. Its meaning, therefore, ought to be so manifestly clear as to preclude the peril of doubt, or the toil of investigation." But does not experience—perhaps our own experience—tell us that they who approach the Bible from such a starting-point will very soon find themselves beset with grievous perplexities? Ignoring the fact that the Divine message, as contained in the Bible, is conveyed to us through human instrumentalities, and that the very labour of searching for the Divine essence amid its earthly accessories is a part of our probation while here below, these students of Holy Writ are driven by their incautious presuppositions to apply to the Bible some rigid theory of verbal or mechanical inspiration, which absolutely excludes the idea of human imperfection from any portion of that Book, and having so done, they fondly hope to escape all further difficulty. Alas for those who cast their anchor into such treacherous holding ground! The storm may come, and if it does, they must drift. They may suffer shipwreck!

Brethren, let us beware of such a mistake. The Bible, blessed be God, is God's Word—for is it not through its pages that He has specially chosen, in His good providence, to make His voice heard by man? But as the Incarnate Word—even He who was the very "Mystery of Godliness"—manifested His glory through the imperfection of human flesh, and thereby submitted mankind to the test of a severe probation—becoming to some a "rock of offence," to others a "corner-stone"—so is it with the Written Word. It has been given to us that we by "patience" (mark the term), as well as "comfort," might have hope. Let us, then, patiently seek to behold in that Book of books the face of Him who is a self-revealing as well as a self-concealing God; and if with all our hearts we thus truly seek Him, we shall surely find Him!

Yes, let us so do, and we shall daily recognise more and more the true inspiration of that Book from above. Every day shall we become more convinced that the Holy Ghost must have so

brooded over the successive stages of its compilation as to fit it to be to man all that God intended it to be; every day shall we more clearly discern that the same Spirit must have so breathed the breath of His life into its message as to have made it, throughout all the sundry times and divers manners of its development, a living and a life-giving power to every patient searcher after truth. And yet, while thus prizing this Book above rubies, we will not exalt the letter above the spirit that breathes therein, we will not accept and value the Gospel because we find it in the Book, rather will we reverence and love beyond measure the Book because of the Evangel which it proclaims.

Oh! how precious, read in such a light, is this Book Divine!—precious, as in very truth the Word of God—precious, as the inspired volume whereby He makes men wise unto salvation—precious, because of all that it has done for sinful, sorrowful, and suffering humanity in every age and every clime—precious, because of what it has done for ourselves—and no less precious, too, because we can examine into its meaning with a calm mind, prayerfully searching, with the help of the Holy Spirit, for the Divine substance amid the human accidents, not looking for absolute certainty and absolute perfection where God has not led us to expect it, and therefore not haunted with the terrible foreboding that the discovery of some flaw, however slight, in the earthly instrumentality, may at any moment compel us to give up all for lost, and to listen no more for the Divine voice that speaks to us thereby!

But there are some who, by reason of this same impatient craving after perfect light, subject themselves to sore disquietude in another form. The search in their case is not for an infallible Book, but for an infallible Interpreter. It seems to them that problems so difficult as those which arise from the study of the Bible could not have been submitted to man for solution without the supplementary provision of some unerring guidance—over and beyond the teaching of the Holy Spirit—whereby all mysteries may be absolutely disclosed. And, proceeding on this assumption—an assumption wholly unwarranted by Scripture, or by the analogy of God's dealings with man in other departments of His providence—they unconditionally surrender their personal responsibility to the authority of what they may deem an infallible Church, or an infallible Pope. Such a solution of their difficulty may indeed seem to them a very easy and a very tranquillising one. But it is a very ignoble, and, as it seems to me, a very awful one. The place of refuge they have chosen is verily a house builded on the sand. And when the winds beat on it it must fall, and the fall of that house will be great!

Such, brethren, are a few of the perils that beset those who, in obedience to the impatient yearnings of their hearts for perfect light, resort to theories, whether as to the inspiration or the

interpretation of the Bible, that are of man's devising, and cannot satisfy in the end. What wonder, alas, if others who cannot accept these theories, and who are equally unwilling to be satisfied with anything less than absolute certainty as to the divine mysteries, should abandon all hope, and lapse into the abyss of absolute unbelief!

But once more. Man's heart craves for something more than perfect truth. It craves also for perfect purity. It demands, in other words, towards the completion of its ideal, perfect holiness in the Church, and perfect holiness in the individual. And did it go no further than to long for, and pray for, and aim after, such a blessed consummation, it would do well. But oh! what disasters have followed from the misguided zeal of those who from age to age have deemed it possible actually to realise, while here on earth, that ideal of a perfectly pure Church, or of a perfectly holy Christian, which can never be looked for till the day when the Lord will take to Himself His spotless Bride, and sit down with her at the marriage supper of the Lamb! Oh! how often, in a spirit of petulant haste, have the servants of the householder gone forth ruthlessly to gather up what they deemed to be the tares, heedless of their Master's command—"Let both grow together until the harvest." And how have brethren been thus separated, and how have Churches been thus broken up into sects, and these sects broken again into fresh fragments, and these broken fragments again and again divided and multiplied by an ever-increasing process of disintegration!

Yes—and how often, alas, have others who have sought for perfect purity in the Church and in the Christian, and who have been disappointed—how often, I say, have such searchers after "the impossible" been driven in the fretfulness of their desperation to say in their hearts—"There is no Church, there are no Christians, there is no Christ, there is no God!"

Lastly, brethren, let us consider the longing for perfection on the part of fallen man, in its relation to another splendid ideal—the ideal of perfect unity.

Unity is a large word, and has many meanings. There is a oneness of brotherhood belonging to every member of the great human race. We are all children of a common Heavenly Father—for are we not all His offspring? We are all entitled to the blessings of a common redemption, for was not Christ's blood shed for the sins of the whole world? Again, there is a nearer oneness of brotherhood between all whose heavenly sonship has been sealed by God in baptism, and who have thereby been given access to all the blessings provided by Him for His people within His Church. Lastly, there is, as all will admit, a oneness of brotherhood, nearer still, among those who have availed themselves of their baptismal privileges, and who are discharging their baptismal responsibilities—and of whom it may in the highest sense be said that they dwell in Christ and

Christ in them, because (to use our Saviour's own explanation of this mutual indwelling) His words abide in them, and they abide in His love.

How far our Saviour's prayer involved an aspiration after the above forms of unity, I will not now inquire. Our Saviour prayed that His Father would so keep and sanctify those whom He had given Him—those who had believed on Him already, or might believe on Him hereafter—that they might be all "one," and that their oneness might be such that the *world should know* that the Father had sent Him. While, therefore, these elements of unity which I have just described (being conditions of the perfect oneness of a redeemed and regenerate humanity) cannot have been absent from the Saviour's mind when He offered up His prayer, the prayer itself would yet seem to have been, not so much for a secret oneness of condition, privilege, or nature, as for some outward manifestation of brotherhood that would appeal to the world without, even as He had already said to His followers, "By this shall all men know that ye are My disciples, if ye have love one to another." It is with this aspect of unity that I desire now to deal—that oneness, I mean, of doctrine, fellowship, worship, and, above all, of love, which, beyond any other form of unity, ought to characterise a divine society, and which for one brief moment seemed on the day of Pentecost to have become the heritage of the Christian Church.

How grand the conception of such a perfectly united Church! How sublime the aspiration that went up heavenwards from the Saviour's lips on that still night beside the brook of Kedron—"That they may be one even as We are one!" Is there a heart here that does not even now feel the vibration of a responsive echo within it saying—"Even so, Father, make us all one, make us one even as Thou and Thy dear Son are one!" And who amongst us does not also feel that it is right for us to pray even as the Saviour prayed for the fulfilment of this glorious ideal?

And yet who that has studied man's perverse nature, as presented to him in the world without, or in his own heart, but will admit that this aspiration of our Blessed Lord was one which, so far as its fulfilment in this world was concerned, must have been secretly accompanied with that conditional reservation annexed to another of His petitions—"If it be possible." And who that has read the page of history, but will further admit, not only that serious divisions began to prevail even in apostolic times, not only that these divisions soon led on to more open disruption, not only that every attempt to recover lost ground, and to realise in Christendom the perfect ideal of Church-unity for which our Saviour prayed, has signally failed, but also that premature and ill-considered efforts to secure such a result have often been productive of no little mischief.

Nor, brethren, does it seem to me reasonable at the present

time to expect anything like that perfect unity for which our hearts so ardently crave. So long as the various denominations of Christendom differ from one another so widely on questions of essential principle, how can that absolute fusion—that distinctly corporate oneness—which seems to be involved in the realisation of complete reunion, be obtained without some fatal compromise of truth? Nay more, how can they who come out from some corrupt branch of the Church Catholic, and separate themselves from her errors, be blamed for what some may deem a new rent in the robe of Christian unity?

It is well, indeed, to promote further unity in Christ's Catholic Church by endeavouring, as far as possible, to bring together those who are now separated; but to obtain this end by any sacrifice of principle would be to buy peace at too high a cost. It is also right to shrink, ourselves, and to discourage others from anything like wanton schism; but what will it profit the cause of Christ, if for the sake of preserving an outward show of unity, we or others should continue to abide beneath the shadow of some deathly error, and thereby lose our own souls. Yes, it is indeed our solemn duty to pray, and long, and strive for the fulfilment of the Saviour's prayer "that all may be one;" but while so doing we must take care, lest in our rashness we may do something to hinder the fulfilment of another of His petitions, "Sanctify them through Thy truth." They that over-hastily pray and strive for the premature realisation of the ideal of perfect purity, forget sometimes, as we have seen, the claims of unity. Let others take care lest in the search for perfect unity, purity may be in peril of suffering grievous loss.

But is there no way of escape from this dilemma? Cannot we in any wise, or to any extent, strive to further the fulfilment of one of these suffrages in the Saviour's intercessory Litany, without hindering thereby the realisation of the other? If there cannot be the unity of fusion, is there no foundation of common truth, such as the Niceno-Constantinopolitan creed, whereupon some of the now divided Churches of Christendom might find a basis for the unity of federation? If anything like corporate re-union be undesirable and impossible, can no provision be made for fraternisation and occasional acts of intercommunion. If, in other words, our unity cannot hope to resemble that of the solid ingot, wherein every particle, losing its own individuality, becomes moulded into one homogeneous and symmetrical whole, might it not take the less rigid form of some great chain, whose links might differ in shape and density, but might, notwithstanding, be held together in one indissoluble bond? At least, brethren, if the idea of such federation or intercommunion, in any fashion, be deemed by some impracticable or undesirable, should we not take every possible opportunity of proving by our words of brotherly love, and by our acts of brotherly kindness, that we desire to recognise as brethren all those who partake with us of

that common grace invoked by the apostle on all, however separated in other respects, who love the Lord Jesus Christ in sincerity and truth!

I have been present, brethren, on occasions when hopes of such a drawing together of the servants of a common Master have been kindled within my heart. I had the privilege of taking part in the Bonn Conference, where representatives of many of the leading Churches of Christendom (episcopal and unepiscopal) met together in loving and brotherlike union, joined in the same grand creed, and offered up the same prayers and praises before a common Throne of Grace. Coming nearer home, I have been present at a Church Congress where, amid tokens of universal enthusiasm, an address was presented by a large body of our Nonconformist brethren to the presiding Bishop, and when, without any abandonment of principle on either side, expressions of mutual love and sympathy were so interchanged as to make all feel that not wholly in vain had the prayer gone up, "Father, I will that they may be one!" These are scenes and subjects on which I should dearly wish to linger; but in the few moments which still remain at my disposal, I desire earnestly to ask your attention to one other aspect of unity, which presents less difficulty than those on which I have hitherto dwelt, and which has a more personal bearing upon each one of us now gathered together at the present time. I speak of that "unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace," which ought to reign amongst us all as members of a common Church, and which this very Congress in which we are all about to take part will, I trust, tend, with God's blessing, to promote.

The unity of which I now speak, and to which I now invite you, is something more than uniformity of creed or ritual, something more than intercommunion or outward fraternisation. It is a unity of feeling, a oneness of sympathy, a drawing together of heart to heart. It is nothing less than the unity enjoined by our Lord when, on the night that He was betrayed, He said, "This is my commandment, that ye love one another as I have loved you." It is, moreover, as I venture with all reverence to believe, the form of unity which entered most largely into the the longings of that Blessed Saviour when on the same night He prayed that His people might be "one!"

Brethren, a gathering together of Churchmen such as that in which we are now taking part is both intended and well fitted to further this oneness for which our Saviour prayed; and let us earnestly hope that such may be the blessed result of our present Congress. But the degree of hope with which such an end may be looked for will depend on the spirit in which we resolve, this very day, to begin our work. And if there be any duty more than another which would seem to devolve on those who have the privilege and the responsibility of preaching the opening sermons on such an occasion, it is the duty of trying to strike some true keynote beneath which our aspirations after unity

should not be allowed to fall. In the hope that, God helping me, I may be able so to do, I would venture, ere I close, to make two suggestions to each one of you, who, either as speakers or listeners, are about to take part in this Congress.

When you enter the crowded hall where by-and-bye we shall meet, and when you look around on a sea of many faces, and hear the hum of many voices, pause for a moment, and with uplifted heart to God for help, think of the tie of brotherhood that should unite you yourself to each individual soul in that great multitude.

Have you ever, when listening to some burst of choral harmony, fixed your gaze on some one singer, and noticed as you did so how that single voice gradually seemed to disentangle itself from the mingling notes around, and to become audible above them all? Well, as you take your place in the Congress Hall this day, and look from one to another of those anxious, earnest faces around you, think how each face tells you of a human life—a life with all the many hopes and fears, and struggles and trials, that have wrestled within that one heart since the far-off days of nursery innocence and childish glee—a life, in all its human infirmity, in all its human cravings, in all its sense of sin and need of help, so like your own! Oh! as you thus look at your brother, and remember his and your common need, will not a thought of oneness as between you and him gradually make itself felt within your heart?

But before you avert your gaze, take one step further. Say to your heart, "For this my brother as for me—to meet his need and mine, to still his cravings and mine—the same Saviour died!" Oh, will not this thought draw even closer the bonds of love! What though this your brother be perchance one whom you have hitherto looked on with suspicion, to whom you have hitherto listened with impatience; yet think of your common need, of your common Saviour, and pray that in that Saviour you and this your brother—yes, you and all your brethren in that vast assemblage—may in very truth be one!

But I have another thought that I would venture to suggest; and in giving it expression I would return to the illustration that I have just used. I would again call up before you the memory of some majestic strain of music, which still, it may be, often haunts your mind; but I would remind you now, not of some single musician amidst the orchestral throng, but rather of some one theme, which formed the continuous burden of that piece—some one sweet melody, rendered forth at first in all its grand simplicity, and then made to pass through ever-varying alternations; heard at times through triumphant chords of massive harmony, at times in plaintive longings, at times in rapid, cheerful movements, at times in the mysterious sorrow of some minor key; adapting itself again and again, in all its changeless beauty, to each variation, without being lost itself.

Brethren, so may it be with this Congress. Throughout all its

multiform diversity may unity reign supreme! Amid all its alternating scenes and varying utterances may one great theme be heard above all else, may one great object be ever manifested —even the glory of our dear Lord and the extension of His Kingdom within our Church and throughout the world! And may God grant that each one of us, as we take our part in this Congress, may remember that it is with a view to this one end above all others that we are here!

It will, no doubt, be pleasant for many of you to see and hear at this Congress some men of note whom you may have known only by report before. You will, moreover, naturally welcome the discussion of questions in which you feel a special interest, and will enjoy not a little, it may be, the sallies of argument and wit and eloquence by which varying opinions will be maintained. The interchange of social hospitalities will also bring together in happy intercourse many who may henceforth become fast friends—some who perhaps before were almost enemies.

This is all as it should be, and for all this prospect of enjoyment, let us thank the Giver of all good gifts. But oh! let us remember that the object of our coming here is something altogether beyond and above all this. Yes, let each one of you, as during the next few days you sit within the Congress Hall, abstract your minds at times from the busy scene around, and in the quietude of your own hearts ask—Why am I here? And as you do, may the one great theme be then heard as it were by you, rising above all the bustle and excitement around—"Glory to God in the highest, and on earth peace, goodwill towards men!" Let us all, dear brethren, try thus to realise the glorious end which as members of this Congress we are bound to keep in view, and then two results must, with God's blessing, follow. First, our minds will be so solemnised as to derive a thousandfold more profit from this Congress than we could otherwise expect. And, secondly, we shall all, with God's help, be led by the thought of this our great common object to a fresh oneness of heart; and in spite of our unhappy divisions and suspicions and prejudices, will feel ourselves gradually banded together, one to another, in our common love for Him who was lifted up in order that He might draw all men unto Him!

And oh! do Thou, Lord Jesus, visit us in this and every successive stage of our solemn gathering with Thy most gracious favour! Grant, Lord, that this Congress may help us all to satisfy our cravings for unity even now in part, and grant that all who attend it may hereafter find place in that great Congress of Thy blessed ones, which shall yet be held above, and where all Thy people shall then, at last, enjoy the perfect fruition of unity in all its fulness, and shall thenceforth and for ever be able to realise the true meaning and efficacy of Thine own prayer—"FATHER, I WILL THAT THEY BE ONE!'

TWENTY-THIRD ANNUAL MEETING

OF THE

CHURCH CONGRESS,

HELD AT READING.

CONGRESS HALL,

TUESDAY AFTERNOON, OCTOBER 2ND, 1883.

At 2 p.m. the Right Rev. the LORD BISHOP OF OXFORD took his seat as President, and delivered the following

INAUGURAL ADDRESS.

I MUST ask your leave to put off for a moment the office I hold as President of the Congress, that, as Bishop of the Diocese, I may welcome the strangers who have done us the honour to attend our assembly to-day. On behalf of this Diocese of Oxford, this Royal county of Berks, this ancient town of Reading, I bid you heartily welcome here. Welcome to the laity, whose opinions we are anxious to hear—welcome to the clergy, on whom the success of the Congress so largely depends—welcome to representative men from our Universities and public schools; to the honoured fathers and prelates of the Church, especially to those who have spoken to us from the pulpits of the three old churches of our town—welcome, above all, to you, my Lord Archbishop, no stranger to Berkshire, on your first attendance at a Congress in your province since you were seated in the throne of Canterbury with universal applause.

And now, as President of the Congress, let me call your attention to the business of our meetings during the week. To have the same list of subjects every year would be tiresome: each Congress may well take

some local colouring from its scene without any forgetfulness of its duty to the Church at large. In this Diocese we have no great masses of population, no imposing displays of national power, no hives of manufacturing industry. The busy swarm of toilers, to which Reading owes its modern prosperity, is scarcely an exception ; its staple has a savour of the quiet fireside and of the social board. In general we are a rustic folk, a people of few words, and inviting no public talk about our concerns. But there is an exception to this simplicity. The noble river, which with its tributaries, flows through nearly all our territory, washes the walls of one of the most famous Universities in Europe, and, before it leaves our borders, flows hard by "the spires and antique towers" of the foremost public school in England. Other schools, only less distinguished than Eton, abound amongst us. Eton's honoured and friendly prototype flourishes in the neighbouring Diocese of Winchester, from which the Congress expects a large contingent to its numbers. Bearing these facts in mind, we desired to give them some reflection in the choice of our subjects here.

We begin to-day with grave questions, such as men of academic culture, serious thinkers, ardent seekers after knowledge may properly discuss. Our statement of them, you observe, implies no foregone conclusion : we assume no contradiction to exist between the great generalisations of science and the Christian faith. Believers ourselves in the One source of truth and life, of whose existence we are as sure as of our own, from whom all the good we have ever known and felt has come, we could not conceive of any physical discovery which should destroy that faith ; but we do not therefore separate ourselves from the votaries of science, or ask them to be untrue to themselves. Somewhere—we are persuaded—in some clearer atmosphere, where all things are seen as they really are, because He, the Light of the World, is seen as He is, these doubts will vanish, these seeming contradictions disappear. For the present we seek—with the quietness which befits men sure of their own moral and spiritual ground—to find out the relations of criticism and discovery to that Christian faith, which shall live when the very subject matter of all material discovery, as we know it now, shall have passed away.

One day in the week we devote almost wholly to subjects connected with education :—one session to the Universities, another to the public schools. It may be said, indeed, with regard to the Universities, that the Church has now no special relation to them ; but I cannot agree with those who so speak. The Church has lost—as it was inevitable

that she should lose—her peculiar privileges in them, and her exclusive rights. But her obligations are what they ever were. It is a question not of ascendancy, but of duty, now. The great body of students in our old Universities have come from Christian homes, "taught by degrees to pray" in the old words of the Church's prayers, obeying her discipline, and holding her faith. Surely she is bound to care for them at the most critical era of their lives. It is no question of liberty of conscience; the Church must do what in her lies to save her sons, while they are at college, from the peril of making shipwreck of faith. Not always, but too often, faith and morals are wrecked in the same disastrous storm. For Oxford (at least) I can say that some of her best and most trusted sons are now anxiously devoting themselves to this duty. The interest which has been widely taken in the memorial to Dr. Pusey is one proof that Churchmen far and near are in earnest sympathy with them. This Congress, I hope, will do something to strengthen their hands.

In the public schools the Church has a more definite *status*. No one in England is so cruel, or so foolish, as to propose that boyhood should be robbed of all religious guidance: and the Church is still, for the most part, its guide. Does she faithfully discharge her trust? You will remember a painfully interesting correspondence in some of the public prints on this subject last year; and you will expect that some light shall be thrown upon it by those who address you on Thursday. The boyish zeal with which we are ready to defend each of us his own school against all comers should help us, when united as we are in this Congress, to deal faithfully with the moral evils which threaten the welfare of them all.

Amongst other subjects connected with education you will have noticed that of Sunday teaching for the children of the *upper* classes—a matter which seems to have had less attention at Church Congresses and elsewhere than it deserves. Sunday observance in general is on our list: and few things are of more immediate concern. In relaxing those restraints which seemed to belong to a Judaical idea of the Sabbath, Churchmen have sometimes neglected to ascertain the real nature and limits of the obligation to keep the Lord's Day. There is some reason to fear a growing tendency not to observe it at all. Look again to the valley where "hoary Thames pursues its silver-winding way" by the pleasant country towns of this diocese, and you will see, as you come nearer to London, a scene of Sunday desecration distressing to those who remember how the oars, which we had plied

so busily all the week, lay untouched on Sunday, however brightly the summer sun might shine. Now the skiff and the canoe dart in and out among barges laden with revellers; and the steam-launch, specially odious at all times to the veteran oarsman, troubles the vexed river with its ceaseless whirl. The idlers cannot omit one day in the week from their quest of pleasure, cannot grant their dependents one day's exemption from work. This is but one local illustration of a general change. I do not forget that like complaints have been heard in former generations. Sunday was ill spent in the days of the Regency, if we may trust Bishop Horsley's eloquent sermon for an account of it. But it was badly spent by bad men then. Against the disregard of Sunday now, good Christians seem to be at a loss to know on what grounds, or to what extent, they ought to protest. Such discussions as ours ought to do something to help men to clear their minds—something to give them firmness and consistency in their practice too.

In the order of proceedings for to-morrow, you will have noticed a departure from the usual rule of Church Congresses. Our morning meeting in the Town Hall is for men only. We have not made this arrangement without hesitation; but the subject to be discussed has so commended itself to the awakened conscience of the Church that it cannot be left out; and we believe that the arrangement we have made is the only one which will secure the necessary freedom of speech. It is urged on the other side that it is time to discard that tradition of mutual reserve which has forbidden free discussion of such subjects at mixed meetings of men and women, as a piece of obsolete etiquette. We do not think so; and we are unwilling to lend the authority, whatever it may be, of this Congress to any proposal in favour of greater laxity in this respect. The Christian ladies, whose presence here to-day is so heartily welcomed, will not misunderstand us. In the cause of purity we need their help; we have small hope of success without it. But they are the best judges of the way to make their own pure influence felt. We desire to teach our sex the lesson of respect for them; and one part of that respect is to be careful that they hear no word from us which could cause them a moment's distress. In the grave question to be discussed, we and they have a common interest. Our homes, our children, our national well-being are at stake. Farewell to the line of brave, manly, unselfish Englishmen, of true-hearted English matrons and maidens, if purity of thought and manners amongst us is suffered to decay!

Closely akin to this is the discussion on the Marriage Laws appointed for to-morrow afternoon. Of the manner in which one proposal for the alteration of those laws has been lately agitated, it is not easy for me to speak with becoming patience. We pointed out to our opponents that their premisses led to a different conclusion from that which their Bill contained; but they did not seem to hear what we said. We asked plain questions, and could get no reply. They affirmed that the husband bears no relationship to those who are nearest and dearest to his wife; that the father is a stranger to the closest of his children's kin. But when they were asked why, in the light of these assertions, they proposed to legislate for a single case alone, and how they distinguished it from other cases, they had not the courage or the honesty to speak a word.

You will think me wanting in caution. I do not forget that the Order to which I belong has been threatened with expulsion from the assembly in which it has held a place from the dawn of England's history, because it refused to support a measure of which its own friends were unable to give an intelligible account. The threat is not one which very deeply moves me. I am not tenacious of temporal honours. But the cause of such a loss, if loss there is to be, affects me very much indeed. I should grieve sorely if hereafter the historian could say with truth that the bishops of England had forfeited their place in Parliament by personal cowardice, by political corruption, by slavish adherence to a party, or subserviency to a Court. I should feel no sense of shame if it were found in the chronicle that the bishops gave the vote which was fatal to their Order, in defence of the purity of English homes, in support of long-settled principles of English law, in accordance with the teaching of the Word of God. So to fall brings no dishonour, leaves no stain, entails the loss of no friends whom an honest man would wish to keep.

I must not further trace the outline of our coming discussions. It will appear from the programme that we call your attention this year to grave subjects affecting the tone of national life, and the Church's relation to them, rather than to party questions, or to those strictly ecclesiastical matters with which synods and convocations have a special right to deal. The question of the courts ecclesiastical is an exception to this remark. It was introduced into our programme at the last moment, when we had just learned that the report of the Royal Commission would be issued before the Congress

met. Into that subject I am precluded by personal reasons from entering. I may say, however, that the great majority of the members of the Royal Commission, on which I had the honour to sit, have not spared time or trouble in fulfilling the duty entrusted to them. The seventy-five meetings at which most of them were present represent only a portion of their labour. Of the work done by one member in particular I may without impropriety speak. In the midst of the many duties, public and private, which belong to the office he holds, Canon Stubbs prepared a full and most instructive account of the ecclesiastical jurisdiction in England from a very early period—an account with which all who profess to handle the subject ought to acquaint themselves. Churchmen owe him no small debt of gratitude for a labour which few other men in England could, or would, have performed. Of the recommendations in the Report itself it is enough for me to say that they provide for the reinforcement of the old ecclesiastical jurisdiction—cleared of some not very successful modern variations—while they do full justice to the supremacy of the Crown, and to the right of Englishmen to appeal for lack of justice in any court to the Sovereign in the last resort. It would be idle to expect that a Report, dealing with so many matters of detail, can be fully or effectively discussed at a Chuch Congress, when it has been only a few weeks in the members' hands. Some little contribution, however, may be made towards the formation of a sound and united opinion among Churchmen, without which no measure of amendment can be submitted to Parliament with any hope of success. Partisans will always estimate the merits of ecclesiastical courts according to the chances of a decision in their own favour, which this or the other constitution of them seems to afford. Good Churchmen ought to prefer that court—whatever it is—in which high character, competent learning, freedom from prejudice, all animated by affectionate loyalty to the Church of Christ, are most likely to adorn the seat of judgment, and to gain respect for its decrees.

The sight of this great assemblage of Churchmen suggests to its President that he should take some notice of the perils which now beset the Church of England in her temporal estate. I forbear to do so; not only because I should be reluctant to narrow the scope of a Congress within the limits of an institution for "Church Defence," but because the sources of hostility to the Church lie far deeper, in my opinion, than the surface present to our view. Moral evil is her real foe. Rival religionists, busy politicians, social theorists are the apparent

assailants ; they have their various reasons, good or bad, for wishing to see the Church less honoured than she is. But behind them is the great, silent army of foes, who hate the Church because she is the prominent religious body in the land. How could they but hate the accredited exponent of those principles of righteousness, against which they are in rebellion all the day long? Estimate, if you can, in any society well known to you, the number of lives uncontrolled by principles of honour and purity, of charity and truth. You have thought of the victims of moral corruption, as they are to be found in prisons and workhouses, in asylums and penitentiaries. You forget that there are more of them in stately dwellings, lingering on beds of sickness which their own vices have courted, or wasting selfish years in the false glitter of rayless homes. When an assault is made upon us, the watchword indeed is none of theirs ; but to a man they are on our assailants' side. Our business is to reduce the number of these secret foes. When an evil-doer is converted, religion has one enemy the less ; not seldom the Church has one loyal friend the more.

Meanwhile, looking abroad at the hostile movements which threaten us, I take the liberty—as we have all come here to speak our minds—of giving one piece of very homely advice to my brother Churchmen :—"Don't make yourselves disagreeable in little things" There are many grave matters in which, for the sake of God and His truth, we *must* needs offend an uncongenial world. Why should we add to that inevitable odium the irritation which grows out of needless offences and trivial wrong? The Church, if it represents true religion, must be unpopular. Why should we make it more unpopular than the necessity of the case requires?

As for discord within the Church—alas ! that internal discord should exist—the friendly intercourse and courteous debates of a Congress week may not be without their healing influence. We shall think too, as we see the faces of old friends from distant dioceses, of great works that are crying out for the zealous service of united Churchmen to accomplish them. I had hoped to be able to announce to you to-day the actual foundation of the See of Southwell. It is needed by a great population ; its creation would fitly express the love and reverence which the whole Church of England bears to the honoured and learned Bishop who asks to be relieved of a burden too heavy for his declining strength—too heavy for the strength of the strongest prelate who may occupy the throne of Lincoln in future days. A deficiency of a few thousand pounds forbids the statement I longed to make—which timely

help would still enable me to make on Friday afternoon. Such hopes and enterprises as this, rather than the worn themes of party strife, will be in our thoughts this week. If we go back to our homes with some rough edges smoothed, some lessons of tolerance learned, some hints for fruitful and united work added to our store, we shall have met to some purpose at this good town of Reading; its friendly citizens and its hospitable and generous Mayor will not have received us in vain.

RECENT ADVANCES IN NATURAL SCIENCE IN THEIR RELATION TO THE CHRISTIAN FAITH.

PAPERS.

PROFESSOR FLOWER, LL.D., F.R.S., Pres. Zool. Soc., etc.

I HAVE been requested by the Subjects Committee of the Congress to place before you a brief statement of some of the advances which have recently been made in natural science, with a view to open a discussion upon their relations, real or supposed, to religious belief. The particular advances which, as I am given to understand, were especially in the minds of the Committee in proposing this question, are those which have resulted in the more or less general adoption by scientific men of the view of the sequence of events which have taken place, and are still taking place in the universe, to which the term "evolution" is now commonly applied.

All that is embraced by this term, the various realms of nature in which its manifestations are traced, the various shades of meaning attached to it by different persons, would constitute far too large and complex a subject to be treated of in the time to which addresses to this meeting are wisely restricted. I will, therefore, select for special consideration the only point in the application of the theory upon which I can speak with any practical knowledge; one which is, however, in the eyes of many of very vital interest. It is the one, at all events, which at the present moment attracts most attention; the new ideas upon it being received with enthusiasm by some, and with distrust, if not with abhorrence, by others.

The doctrine of continuity, or of direct relation of event to some preceding event according to a natural and orderly sequence is now generally recognised in the inorganic world; and although the modern expansion of this doctrine as applied to the living inhabitants of the earth, appears to many so startling, and has met with so much opposition, it is, in a more restricted application, a very old and widespread article of scientific as well as of popular faith.

Putting aside, as quite immaterial to the present discussion, the still controverted question of the evidences of the production of the lowest and most rudimentary forms of life from inorganic matter, it may be stated as certain that there is no rational and educated person, whatever his religious beliefs or philosophical views, who is not convinced that every individual animal or plant, sufficiently highly organised to deserve such distinctive appellation, now existing upon the world, has been produced from pre-existing parents by the operation of a series of processes of the order to which the term natural is commonly applied; processes also fundamentally the same throughout the whole range of living beings, however much modified in detail to suit the various manifestations under which those beings are presented to us. We feel absolutely certain, when we see a horse, a bird, a butterfly, or an oak-tree, that each was derived from pre-existing parents, more or less closely resembling itself. Though we may have no direct evidence of the fact in each individual case, the knowledge derived from the combined observations of an overwhelming number of analogous cases, is of such a positive character, that we should entirely refuse to credit any one who made the contrary assertion, and should feel satisfied that he had been deluded by some error of observation. We cannot, indeed, conceive of the sudden beginning of any such creatures, either from nothing, from inorganic matter, or even from other animals or plants totally unlike themselves.

To persons whose opportunities of observation of animal and plant life are limited to a comparatively few kinds, existing under comparatively similar circumstances, and which observations moreover only extend over a comparatively limited period of time, it appears that in each kind of animal or plant such as those just mentioned, individuals of various succeeding generations present a very close resemblance to each other. That they often vary a little cannot escape careful observation, but the deviations from the common characters of the kind to be noticed by persons whose range of vision is thus limited are not striking, and usually appear not to pass beyond certain bounds. Hence arose the common idea, natural enough under such circumstances, but which gradually developed itself, not only into a scientific hypothesis, but even, it would appear, almost into an article of religious belief, that the different kinds or "species," as they are technically called, of animals and plants, had each its separate origin, its fixed limits of variation, and could not under any circumstances become modified or changed into any other form.

This idea became deeply rooted in the human mind, in consequence of the very long period during which it prevailed, the horizon of observation having remained practically stationary from the time man first began to observe and record the phenomena of nature, until little more than a century ago, when commenced that sudden expansion of knowledge of the facts of the animal and vegetable world, which has been steadily widening ever since. Now it is important to observe that it is strictly *pari passu* with the growth of knowledge of the facts, that the theoretical views of nature have changed, and the older hypothesis of species to which I have referred has gradually given way to a new and different one.

The expansion of the special branches of knowledge affecting

our views upon this subject has taken place in many different directions, of which I can here only indicate the most striking.

1.—The discovery of enormous numbers of forms of life, the existence of which was entirely unknown a hundred years ago. The increase of knowledge in this respect is something inconceivable to those who have not followed its progress. Not only has the number of well defined species known multiplied prodigiously, but infinite series of gradations between what were formerly supposed to be distinct species are being constantly brought to light. The difficulty of giving any satisfactory definition of what is meant by the term "species" is increasingly felt day by day by practical zoologists, as evidenced by the introduction of such terms as "sub-species," "permanent local variety," etc., into general use, and especially by the wide differences of opinion as to the number or limits of the species included in any given group of animals or plants among naturalists who have made such group their special study.

2.—Vast increase in the knowledge of the intimate structure of organic bodies, both as revealed by ordinary dissection, and by microscopic examination, a method of investigation only brought to perfection in very recent years. By the knowledge thus acquired, has been demonstrated the unity of plan pervading, under diverse modifications, the different members of each natural group of organisms, at one time attributed to "conformity to type," a so-called explanation, which explained nothing, but for which a *vera causa* may be found in descent from a common ancestor. Wonderful gradations in the perfection to which different structures have attained in the progress of their adaptation to their respective purposes have also been shown, and of still greater importance and interest, the numerous cases of apparently useless or rudimentary organs in both animals and plants, which were absolutely unaccounted for under the older hypothesis.

3.—The comparatively new study of the geographical distribution of living things, which has only become possible since the prosecution of the systematic and scientific explorations of the earth's surface which have distinguished the present century. The results of this branch of enquiry alone have been sufficient to convince many naturalists of the unsoundness of the old view of the distinct origin of species, whether created each in the region of the globe to which it is now confined, or as many still imagine, all in one spot, from which they have spread themselves unchanged in form, colour, or other essential attributes to their present abodes, however diverse in climate and other environments or conditions of existence.

4.—Lastly, though most important of all, must be mentioned the entirely new science of palæontology, opening up worlds of organic life before unknown, also showing infinite gradations of structure, but mainly important as increasing our horizon of observation to an extent not previously dreamt of in the direction of time. Powers of observation formerly limited to the brief space of a few generations are now extended over ages, which the concurrent testimony of various branches of knowledge, of astronomy, cosmogony, and geology, show are immeasurable compared with any periods of which we hitherto had cognisance. We are enabled to trace, and every year, as discovery succeeds discovery, with increasing distinctness, numerous cases of

sequences of modification running through groups of animals in successive periods of time, such as the gradual progress in the development and perfection of the antlers of deer, from their entire absence in the earliest known representatives of the type, through the simple conical or bifurcated form, increasing in complexity as time advanced to the magnificent many-branched appendages which adorn the heads of some species of recent stags, such also as the progressive modifications, so often described, beginning in the short-necked, heavy-limbed, many-toed tapir-like animal of the Eocene period, and ending in the graceful, long-necked, light-limbed, single-toed horse of our own age, and numerous others which time will not allow me even to mention.

It would be impossible here to trace the history of the effect of this enormous influx of knowledge upon the doctrine of the separate origin and fixed characters of species; to narrate the scattered efforts of philosophical minds, discontented with the former views, but not yet clearly seeing the light; to describe the slow and struggling growth of the new views, amid difficulties arising from imperfections of knowledge, and the opposition of prejudice, or to apportion to each of those who by their labours have contributed to the final result, his exact share in bringing it about. How much, for instance, is due to the work and the writings of our illustrious countryman, Darwin? and how much to those who have preceded or followed him? All this forms an episode in the history of the progress of human knowledge which has been abundantly chronicled elsewhere.

The result may, however, be briefly stated to be, that the opinion now almost, if not quite, universal among skilled and thoughtful naturalists of all countries, and whatever their beliefs upon other subjects, is that the various forms of life which we see around us, and the existence of which we know from their fossil remains, are the product, not of independent creations, but of descent, with gradual modification from pre-existing forms. In short, the law of the natural descent of individuals, of varieties, races, or breeds (which being within the limits of the previous powers of observation, was already universally admitted) has been extended to the still greater modifications constituting what we call species, and consequently to the higher groups called genera, families and orders. The barrier fancied to exist between so-called varieties and so-called species has broken down.

Anyone commencing the study of the subject at the present time without prejudice, and carefully investigating the evidence upon which to form his conclusions, bearing in mind that he must look for his proofs, not so much in direct experiments or absolute demonstrations, which from the nature of the case are impossible, but in the convergence of the indications furnished by the interpretations of multitudinous facts of most diverse kinds, must find it extremely difficult to place himself in the position of those who held the older view, so much more reasonable, so much more in accordance with all that we know of the general phenomena of nature does this new one seem. In fact the *onus probandi* now appears entirely to lie with those who make the assertion that species have been separately created. Where, it may be asked, is the shadow of a scientific proof that the first individual of any species has come into being without pre-existing parents? Has any competent observer at any time witnessed such an occurrence? The

apparent advent of a new species in geological history, a common event enough, has certainly been cited as such. As well might the presence of a horse in a field, with no sign of other animals of the same kind near it, be quoted as evidence of the fallacy of the common view of the descent of individuals. Ordinary observation tells us of the numerous causes which may have isolated that horse from its parents and kindred. Geologists know equally well how slight the chances of more than a stray individual or fragment of an individual here and there being first preserved and afterwards discovered to give any indication of the existence of the race. Those who object to the new view, complain sometimes of the frequency with which its advocates take refuge, as they call it, in the "imperfection of the geological record." I think, on the contrary, the difficulty is always to allow sufficiently for this imperfection. When we contrast the present knowledge of palæontology with what it was fifty, or even ten years ago ; when we see by what mere accident as it were, a railway driven through a new country, a quarry worked for commercial purposes, a city newly fortified, all the most important discoveries of extinct animals have been made, we must be convinced that all arguments drawn from the absence of the required links are utterly valueless. The study of palæontology is as yet in its merest infancy, the wonder is that it has already furnished so much, not so little, corroboration of the doctrine of transmutation of species.

Direct proof is, then, equally absent from both theories. For the old view it may be said that it has been held for a very long time by persons whose knowledge of the facts of nature which bear upon it was extremely limited. On the other hand, the new view is continually receiving more support as that knowledge increases, and furnishes a key to a vast number of otherwise inexplicable facts in every branch of natural history, in geological and geographical distribution, in the habits of animals, in their development and growth, and especially in their structure. Allow me to take one instance from the last named— the anatomy of the whale. How is it possible, upon any other supposition than that it is the descendant of some land animal, with completely developed limbs and teeth, which has become gradually modified to suit an aquatic mode of existence, to explain the presence of the numerous rudimentary, and to their present possessors absolutely useless structures found in its body. Amongst others, a complete set of teeth, existing only in embryonic life, entirely disappearing even before birth, and rudimentary hind legs, with their various bones, joints, and muscles, of which no trace is seen externally. It may be asserted that the whale was originally created so, as it was asserted, and long maintained, that fossil shells and bones were originally created as such in the rocks in which they are found. It took more than two centuries of continuous and most acrimonious discussion to convince the world, especially the theological world, that these were the actual remains of animals which had once lived in a former period of the earth's history. Their evidence is now, however, universally admitted as supplying knowledge of the changed conditions of the surface of the earth, and with equal clearness do these rudimentary organs, hidden in the secret recesses of the whale's body, furnish, to those who enquire, indications that the animal has passed through phases of existence unlike those in which we now see it.

I do not for a moment assert that the new view explains everything that we students of nature are longing to know, or that we do not everywhere meet with obscure problems and perplexing difficulties, facts that we cannot account for, and breaks in the chain of evidence. As to the details and mode of operation of the secondary laws by which variation and modification have been brought about, we are far from being in accord. Happy for us that it is so, or our work would be at an end. I only maintain that the transmutation view removes more difficulties, requires fewer assumptions, and presents so much more consistency with observed facts than that which it seeks to supersede, and is, therefore, so generally accepted, that there is no more probability of its being abandoned, and the old doctrine of the fixity of species revived, than that we should revert to the old astronomical theories which placed the earth in the centre of the universe, and limited the date of its creation to six ordinary days.

The question of the fixity or the transmutation of species is a purely scientific one, only to be discussed and decided on scientific grounds. To the naturalist, it is clearly one of extreme importance, as it gives him for the first time a key to the interpretation of the phenomena with which he has to deal. It may seem to many that a question like this is entirely beside the business of a Church Congress, as it is one with which only those expert in the ways of scientific investigation, and deeply imbued with knowledge of scientific facts, could be called upon to deal. This would certainly have been my view, if it had not been that some who, from their capacities and education, should have been onlookers in such a controversy, awaiting the issues of the conflict while the lists are being fought out by the trained knights, have rushed into the fray, and by their unskilful interposition have only confused the issues, casting about dust instead of light. In the hope of clearing away some of this dust the present discussion has been decided upon.

It is self-evident that a solid advance of any branch of knowledge must, in some way or other, and to a greater or less degree, influence many others, even those not directly connected with it, and therefore the rapid simultaneous strides of so many branches of knowledge as may be embraced under the term of "Recent Advances in Natural Science," will be very likely to have some bearing upon theological beliefs. Whether in the direction of expanding, improving, purifying, elevating or in the direction of contracting, hardening, and destroying, depends not upon those engaged in contributing to the advance of science, but upon those whose special duty it is to show the bearing of these advances upon hitherto received theological dogmas. The scientific questions themselves may well be left to experts. If the new doctrines are not true, there are plenty of keen critics among men of science ready to sift the sound from the unsound. Error in scientific subjects has its day, but it is certain not long to survive the ordeal, yearly increasing in severity, to which it is subjected by those devoted to its cultivation. On the other hand, the advances of truth, though they may be retarded, will never be stopped by the opposition of those who are incompetent by the nature of their education to deal with the evidence on which it rests. There is no position so fraught with danger to religion as that which binds it up essentially with this or that scientific

doctrine, with which it must either stand or fall. The history of the reception of the greatest discoveries in Astronomy and Geology, the passionate clinging to the exploded pseudo-scientific views on those subjects supposed to be bound up with religious faith, the fierce denunciations of the advocates of the then new, but now universally accepted ideas, are well worn subjects, and would not be alluded to but for the repetition, almost literal repetition in some cases, of that reception which has been accorded to the new views of biology.

Ought not the history of those discoveries and the controversies to which they gave rise, to be both a warning and an encouragement? Those who hoped and those who feared that faith would be destroyed by them, have been equally mistaken; and is it not probable that the same result will follow the great biological discoveries and controversies of the present day?

In stating thus briefly what is the issue of these discoveries, as generally understood and accepted by men of science, I have done all that I promised, and must leave, in far more competent hands, the part of the subject especially appropriate for discussion at this meeting. I may, however, perhaps be allowed to put a few plain and simple considerations before you, which may have some bearing upon the subject, and which have no pretensions to novelty; though being often lost sight of, their repetition may do no harm.

I said at the commencement of this paper that it has long been admitted by all educated persons, whatever their religious faith may be, that that very universal, but still most wonderful process, the commencement and gradual development of a new individual of whatever living form, whether plant, animal, or man, takes place according to definite and regularly acting laws, without miraculous interposition. Further than this, I believe that every one will admit that the production of the various races or breeds of domestic animals is brought about by similar means. We do not think it necessary to call in any special intervention of creative power to produce a short-horned race of cattle, or to account for the difference between a bull dog and a greyhound, a Dorking and a Cochin China fowl. The gradual modifications by which these races were produced, having taken place under our own eyes as it were, we are satisfied that they are the consequence of what we call natural laws, modified and directed in these particular cases by man's agency. We have even gone further, having long admitted, without the slightest fear of producing a collision with religious faith, that variation has taken place among animals in a wild state, producing local races of more or less stable and permanent character, and brought about by the influence of food, climate, and other surrounding circumstances.

The evidences of the Divine government of the world and of the Christian faith, have been sufficient for us, notwithstanding our knowledge that the individual was created according to law, and that the race or variety was also created according to law. In what way then can they be affected by the knowledge that the somewhat greater modifications, which we call species, were also created according to law? The difficulties, which to some minds seem insuperable, remain exactly as they were; the proofs, which to others are so convincing, are entirely unaffected by this widening of scientific knowledge.

Even to what is to many the supreme difficulty of all, the origin of man, the same considerations are applicable. Believe everything you will about man in his highest intellectual and moral development, about the nature, origin, existence, and destiny of the human soul; you have long been able to reconcile all this with the knowledge of his individual material origin according to law, in no whit different in principle from that of the beasts of the field, passing through all the phases they go through, and existing long before possessing, except potentially, any of the special attributes of humanity. At what exact period, and by what means the great transformation takes place, no one can tell. If the most Godlike of men have passed through the stages which physiologists recognise in human development without prejudice to the noblest, highest, most divine part of their nature, why should not the race of mankind, as a whole, have had a similar origin, followed by similar progress and development, equally without prejudice to its present condition and future destiny? Can it be of real consequence at the present time, either to our faith or our practice, whether the first man had such an extremely lowly beginning as the dust of the earth, in the literal sense of the words, or whether he was formed through the intervention of various progressive stages of animal life?

The reign of order and law in the government of the world has been so far admitted that all these questions have really become questions of a little more or a little less order and law. Science may well be left to work out the details as it may. It has thrown some light, little enough at present, but ever increasing, and for which we should all be thankful, upon the processes or methods by which the world, in which we dwell, has been brought into its present condition. The wonder and mystery of Creation remains as wonderful and mysterious as before. Of the origin of the whole, science tells us nothing. It is still as impossible as ever to conceive that such a world, governed by laws, the operations of which have led to such mighty results, and are attended by such future promise, could have originated without the intervention of some power external to itself. If the succession of small miracles, formerly supposed to regulate the operations of nature, no longer satisfies us, have we not substituted for them one of immeasurable greatness and grandeur?

The Right Rev. the Lord Bishop of Carlisle.

There is a fundamental antithesis between science and faith; science implies knowledge, which compels belief by an intellectual necessity; faith means belief, and in a certain sense knowledge, but a belief which is not irresistible, and a knowledge which cannot base itself on mathematical demonstration; science and faith correspond to opposite poles of the human mind. Science taught Eve that a certain tree was pleasant to the eyes; faith said, ye shall not eat of it; and in the Garden of Eden, as so often in the wide world ever since, faith gave way, and knowledge gained a ruinous victory.

The fundamental antithesis between science and faith does not imply a necessary contradictory opposition. This is an assertion upon which much might be said, but it is not my business to say it to-day.

The subject intrusted to me does not involve science and faith in all their generality, but is restricted to *recent* advances in *Natural* science, and to the *Christian* faith.

These are important limitations. Not faith, but the *Christian* faith, that is, the Apostles' Creed. The question with which we are concerned is not whether recent advances in natural science point to a reconsideration of some portions of what may be called popular theology, but whether those advances have either helped or hindered the reception of the alleged revelation concerning Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, which the Apostles' Creed contains.

Again, it is not natural science, but *recent advances* in the same, with which we are concerned. It will be conceded that the Copernican theory of the solar system, and the discoveries of Newton and the recognised doctrines of geology, have not interfered with the foundations of the faith: the panics which have risen from time to time have subsided under the influence of calm thought, and men of judgment have perceived that the difficulties of the Christian faith were substantially the same before science began to march as they have been since, affected, no doubt, in some degree by shadows cast upon them from scientific discussions, but still substantially the same.

This being so, my next step is to ask, What is meant by "recent advances in science?" I answer by reference to an unimpeachable authority, the address of Sir John Lubbock, as President of the British Association for the Advancement of Science, at York, in 1881. The following are the President's words :—

"Summing up the principal results which have been attained in the last half century, we may mention (over and above the accumulation of facts) the theory of evolution, the antiquity of man, and the far greater antiquity of the world itself; the correlation of physical forces, and the conservation of energy; spectrum analysis and its application to celestial physics; the higher algebra and the modern geometry; lastly, the innumerable applications of science to practical life—as, for instance, in photography, the locomotive engine, the electric telegraph, the spectroscope, and most recently the electric light and the telephone."

It is obvious that, with the exception of the first three items in this list, there is not one calculated to excite even a ripple upon the surface of religious opinion. Photography and spectrum analysis, and even the correlation of forces and the conservation of energy, though they be subjects to try the intellectual strength of those who grapple with them, can in no way affect religious belief. And even of the first three items two may perhaps be dismissed without requiring sureties for good behaviour. The antiquity of the globe has long been regarded as a truth which no one can doubt, and which no believer need wish to doubt; and even the antiquity of man, as put in evidence by recent discoveries, is not considered, so far as I know, as a fatal objection to belief in Him who in the fulness of time condescended to become a member of the human family, be its antiquity what it may.

If we dismiss, therefore, "the antiquity of man and the far greater antiquity of the world itself," as harmless members of Sir J. Lubbock's scientific company, we are reduced to "the theory of evolution," as the one possible enemy to the Christian faith amongst the "recent advances in natural science."

And so the issue to be tried is this: Is there anything in the theory

of evolution which, as honest men, we feel bound to receive, and which is destructive of faith in Jesus Christ?

In trying this issue it is only fair to bear in mind—first, that evolution is found (as we have seen) in good company; and, secondly, that charges have often been brought against alleged scientific truths which have ultimately proved to be groundless.

But especially it should be borne in mind, that we have to deal (as I have argued elsewhere) with evolution *and* evolution. Evolution may imply a doctrine which is merely a statement of careful induction from observed facts, and which it is difficult for any reasonable man to put on one side; and evolution may be taken to include doctrines inconsistent, not only with the being of God, and therefore with any revelation from God, but even with the most simple axioms of the human intellect. Let me quote, in illustration of my meaning, a short passage from the Harveian Oration, delivered by Dr. Ogle, in 1881. Speaking of the great Harvey, Dr. Ogle says (p. 63) :—

"Had he lived now, he would, most probably, have acquiesced in that teaching of evolution and adaptation in animal and vegetable life with which, originated by Wolff in the middle of the last century, then taken up by Lamarck, we have become familiar under the name of Darwinism; though not, of course, those unmeasured and extreme opinions on this subject by which some indeed have outheroded Herod."

It will not be expected, nor is it possible, that I should go into a discussion of the theory of evolution; but it may be well to say as much as this—namely, that not a little of the difficulty which has arisen in connection with this most recent phase of scientific thought seems to rest upon the assumption that the Biblical account of Creation is a scientific treatise, which it manifestly is not, and that the Biblical account of man and the scientific are *in pari materiâ*. Deal with man as a moral being, and nothing can be more complete than the Scripture history of his appearance in the world; deal with him as a portion of earth's physical environment, and then it is clear, not only that the Biblical account does not meet the scientific requirements of the case (which doubtless it was never intended to do), but that something of the nature of evolution, of growth, of development, is to be expected—I am not sure that it is possible to frame a mental conception of the appearance of man upon the earth without some hypothesis of an evolutional kind. This, however, does not deny creation nor get rid of the postulate of a God: it only indicates the course which creation takes, and the laws according to which God is pleased to manifest His will.

It might, perhaps, be contended that it is impossible for science, or any advance in science, to be injurious to the holding of the faith once delivered to the saints. But experience would not support this contention. The reason is not far to seek. Faith is of necessity preter-natural, and natural science of equal necessity emphasises the natural, and throws it into special prominence. Hence the first effect of the study of natural science is to dispose the mind against the reception of anything beyond. The constant contemplation of law makes it difficult to recognise the possibility of cases in which the law does not hold. Special studies not unfrequently unfit the mind for dealing with subjects outside the limits of those studies. And so it would be a mistake to assert that there is no tendency in science, and especially in natural science, to shake men's faith in alleged truths,

which are unable to base themselves upon scientific foundations. But it is important to observe in connection with the subject of this paper, that the tendency in question has little or nothing to do with "*recent advances* in natural science;" the strain, whatever it may be, would be felt by contemporaries of Laplace, as much as by contemporaries of Darwin; and it may be rightly urged that the battle of faith and science was fought out in the eighteenth century, and need not be renewed in the nineteenth. In particular the cardinal miracle and fact of the Christian creed, the Resurrection of our Lord from the dead, stands where it always has stood; no advance of science can either increase or diminish the difficulty of accepting the miracle: the science of former days was abundantly sufficient to suggest all the difficulties that can be suggested: if the Resurrection was credible before the days of evolution, it is credible now: and if Christ be not risen from the dead and so our faith proved to be vain, then it is not evolution, or any other scientific doctrine by which the faith is overthrown.

The general conclusion to which I have come, and which I desire to suggest in this paper, is that while it is impossible to deny that recent times have witnessed a terrible outburst of atheism and unbelief, and while it is necessary to concede that this outburst has been practically not a little connected with scientific speculations, it may be safely affirmed that recent advances in natural science do not lead logically, and therefore ought not to lead at all, to either unbelief or atheism. Sir James Paget has lately (in 1881) said that "The acceptance of the doctrine of evolution has changed the course of thinking in whole departments of science;" and it may be that a similar effect will be produced in whole departments of theology; the acceptance of the views of Copernicus certainly had this result, so had the acceptance of those of Galileo, so with Newton, so with the teaching of modern geology; and so it may be with the teaching of evolution; but as Sir James Paget does not look with apprehension upon changes in the "course of thinking" in science, so we may regard without alarm any change which may be produced in theological thinking: the foundations of science stand secure, the foundations of theology stand secure too. Courses of thinking may change: the subject of thought is eternal, for ever unchanged, and unchangeable.

The attitude of mind which becomes ordinary Christian men and women is that of humble recipients of scientific truth. They should distinguish between scientific teaching and the moral or religious conclusions of some scientific men; the two things are very different, and may be differently treated. We may well claim as an axiom to be granted both by wise and simple, that the ultimate cause of all is the divine will; and then the theories of science may indicate and illustrate in the most instructive manner the methods by which that divine will has manifested and is manifesting itself. If we look upon evolution from this point of view, what it asserts concerning the divine will is that it has manifested itself by slow continuous growth, and that the chronic growth of worlds and species is in harmony with more rapid growths of individual animals and plants; the maxim *nihil per saltum* is extended to cosmogony, and such extension no more leads, logically, to infidelity than the undeniable assertion that development is the universal law of terrestrial life.

In truth, an ordinary Christian is no more bound to have an opinion on the subject of evolution, than he is bound to have one on the laws of electricity or the stability of ships; but evolution is in the air; people talk about it, both those who understand what they are talking about and those who do not; and the suspicion has been evolved that evolution is opposed to the Catholic faith, and that the recognition of evolution as a scientific truth is the same thing as infidelity; God forbid that this should be so; and especially it devolves upon the clergy and upon all educated men and women to take care that no rash language used by them shall have a tendency to strengthen this suspicion. Let them hold fast the faith, and act out the faith in their lives, and let scientific men pursue their course in peace.

What may be the future of the Christian faith in England, this is not the occasion to speculate. There are clouds in the sky, but I think there is sunshine too. One thing I would venture to say with some confidence concerning the future, that if ever the faith of Christ should suffer an eclipse in this our dear native land, it will not be the advances of science, but the progress of something much less divine, that will be the cause of the eclipse.

The Rev. AUBREY L. MOORE, Tutor of Keble College, Oxford; Examining Chaplain to the Lord Bishop of Oxford.

IT would be obviously impertinent in me, in the presence of distinguished representatives of science, to attempt to lay before this Congress the evidence for or against that great generalisation with which recent advances in natural science are more or less completely identified. The discussion of the evidence belongs to men of science, not to clergymen. We who are not scientific, or whose study of nature is limited to a narrow area, may, and perhaps must, have our own beliefs, our own individual opinions, on scientific questions. But my object in the time allowed me will be to show—

(I). That whatever be the views of individual theologians, and whatever the final judgment which advancing science shall give, Christian theology *as such* is not necessarily connected either with evolution or the denial of evolution; and

(II). That there is in this doctrine of evolution much which ought to render it specially attractive to those whose first thought is to hold and to guard every jot and tittle of the Catholic faith.

Of these two theses I am persuaded that the first is infinitely the more important, indeed that, if it could be established, not only would students of nature be allowed, what they surely have a right to claim, perfect freedom of investigation within their own province; but a doctrine, which is now weighted by supposed materialistic implications, would be gladly welcomed as an intelligible and reasonable account of God's creative activity in the world around us.

It is not to the point now to say whether theologians or men of science are most to blame for the confusions which certainly exist in this matter. If theologians have too often shown an unreasoning jealousy and suspicion of scientific inquiry, men of science have

certainly not gone out of their way to make the real question at issue plain. When a champion of evolution* throws down this challenge to the Christian world—"Natural evolution, or supernatural creation of species—we must choose one of these, for a third there is not,"—we can hardly wonder that the devout and unsuspecting believer is caught in the trap of a false antithesis. *A third there is.* And we may call it indifferently supernatural evolution or natural creation. For the antithesis between evolution and creation is as false as, in the mouth of Haeckel, is the antithesis of natural and supernatural. Evolution, to make it a rational system, as much implies the presence in it of a power which is above nature as creation does. For evolution *is* creation, and there is nothing *natural* which is not *supernatural.*

This is no mere paradox. The false antithesis lies at the root of many of our present difficulties. Even Christians have come to acquiesce in a sort of unconscious Deism. They are content to let the student of nature devote himself to the elucidation of natural processes, if he will not become a dogmatist by negation and say there is no supernatural. Such a division of territory the defender of science is generally willing to accept. "Give me," he will say, "the region of the knowable, the intelligible, and your fancy or your faith may revel as it will in the region of the unknown. Only there must be no cataclysmal irruptions of the supernatural into the region of the natural, no miracles, no Divine interferences with the course of nature—here at least all must be under the reign of law." And very soon those who have thus unwisely become the champions of the supernatural against the natural find that as knowledge grows they have to retire farther and farther back, and they either make frantic efforts at reprisals, or they settle down into a dull conservative protest against science as the enemy of faith.

Bishop Butler had a far truer view of what "natural" means. It is that which is "stated, fixed, or settled"—in other words, something which is familiar; and he adds, "from hence it must follow that persons' notions of what is natural will be enlarged in proportion to their greater knowledge of the works of God."† The distinction, then, is not absolute, but relative to our growing knowledge. To perfect knowledge God's working in the physical and moral world must be all natural, or, if you will, all supernatural. It cannot be partly one and partly the other, though to us the *quotidiana Dei miracula*, as St. Gregory calls them, seem to differ in kind from His less familiar workings. The moment we accept such a division as real, we practically recognise the existence of a power other than God; and then, while nature becomes to us the expression of order, law, stately and rational procedure, God is represented as the antithesis of this, as motiveless volition, as a principle of indeterminateness which it is hard to distinguish from caprice.

If we are ever to approach scientific problems in the spirit of Christian theology, we must, at the risk of paradox, declare that the common distinction between the natural and the supernatural is

---

* Haeckel—"Freedom in Science and Teaching." Eng. Tran. p. 1.
† "Anal." Part. 1, ch. i.

unreal and misleading. There are not, and cannot be, any Divine interpositions in nature, for God cannot interfere with Himself. His creative activity is present everywhere. There is no division of labour between God and nature, or God and law. "If He thunder by law, the thunder is yet His voice." The plant which is produced from seed by the "natural" laws of growth is His creation. The brute which is born by the "natural" process of generation is His creation. The plant or animal which, by successive variations and adaptations, becomes a new species (if this is true) is His creation. "The budding of a rose," it has been said,* "and the resurrection of Jesus Christ are equally the effect of the one Motive Force, which is the cause of all phenomena." A theory of "supernatural interferences" is as fatal to theology as to science.

We need hardly stop to remind ourselves how entirely this is in accord with the relation of God and nature, always assumed in the Bible. What strikes us at once, trained as we are in the language of science, is the *immediateness* with which everything is ascribed to God. He makes the grass to grow upon the mountains. To Him the young ravens look up for food. He holds the winds in the hollow of His hand. Not a sparrow falls without His knowledge. He numbers the hairs of our head. Of bird and beast and flower, no less than of man, it is true that in Him they "live and move and have their being." "O Lord, how glorious are Thy works!" For the Christian theologian *the facts of nature are the acts of God.*

Both theology and science thus become, though in different ways, an *interpretatio naturae.* The province of both is to *rationalise.* Rationalism, when used as a term of reproach, is not the attempt to render God's works, in nature or in grace, intelligible to reason, but the refusal to recognise as His anything which we do not understand. Theology relates together all the acts of God, integrating them as parts in a great moral purpose; and science also relates together the acts of God, as seen in nature, finding in them a rational and intelligible unity. In theology the moral purpose is more prominent; in science the rational cohesion; and partisans generally fail to see that these are the convex and concave of truth.

If theology goes beyond science, it is because science has fixed its own limits in declaring itself *positive.* It accepts nothing as a fact which cannot ultimately be brought to the test of sensible experience. All facts so attested it seeks to relate into a whole, which is so far complete. But even in its ideal completeness it is cradled in mystery, and encompassed by the world of the scientifically unknowable. "Science," to quote H. Spencer's definition, "is partially unified knowledge," but theology claims to be "completely unified knowledge." Materialism, pantheism, atheism, positivism, agnosticism, are the natural efforts of the reason to explain or put out of sight what is strictly by positive science unknowable. Only the moment a scientific man consciously or unconsciously formulates a theory which can properly be called by any one of these names, he transcends the limits of positive science at least as completely as if he had said, "I believe in God the Father Almighty, Maker of heaven and earth."

* W. S. Lilly. Cot. Rev. 1883, p. 119.

And scientific evolution is in every respect subject to the limits of positive science. It cannot, therefore, give an absolute "yes" or "no" to those truths which Christians hold dear, the existence of God, the reality of the human soul, and its real relation with God Himself.

Still there are two points in which evolution is thought somehow to come into collision with faith. It is popularly supposed (i.) to suggest an alternative for the original creation of the world by God; and (ii.) to materialise the soul of man.

(i). As to *Creation*. "In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth," "I believe in God the Father Almighty, maker of heaven and earth." What has evolution to say to this dogma? Absolutely *nothing*. If we exclude those pantheistic theories of development, which, though they have little attractiveness for the students of positive science, have from the days of Gnosticism to the time of Spinoza and Hegel denied the dogma of creation, evolution knows nothing of primary and original creation. Haeckel, whom I quote because of his avowed and defiant opposition to Christian dogma, says plainly that "the process, if indeed it ever took place, is completely beyond human comprehension, and can, therefore, never become a subject of scientific inquiry."* Herbert Spencer, in discussing the "theistic hypothesis," creation by external agency (after ridiculing a view of world-manufacturing which no Christian would take the trouble to defend or refute), concludes that "the production of matter out of nothing is the real mystery," and this, like atheism and pantheism, is said to be "literally unthinkable."† Tyndall, again, says of the "evolution hypothesis," it "does not solve—it does not profess to solve—the ultimate mystery of this universe. It leaves, in fact, that mystery untouched."‡ The difficulty of primary creation is, of course, independent of the question, what it was which was so called out of nothing; whether by the word of Omnipotence the whole world of organic and inorganic nature flashed into being; or whether, as St. Augustine suggested, the germs of all things were at first created; or whether that primary act concerned only an unconscious primæval mist, the infinite potentialities of which have developed, under the Hand of God, into the genius of Shakespeare and Raphael, and St. Paul—the act is, in any case, as Mr. Spencer says, unthinkable, or rather, unimaginable. If it is ever made intelligible to us it must be from the side of metaphysics or theology, and not positive science. For science cannot relate two terms, one of which is unknowable.

But though neither positive science nor evolution touch the original creation of the world by God, it would be idle to deny that they can create a prejudice for or against the Christian dogma. And here, strangely enough, evolution appears on the Christian side. For if positive science, by its teaching as to the indestructibility of matter within experience, creates a prejudice against any original creation, evolution, the greatest inductive generalisation of positive science, creates a prejudice in its favour. For it is "unthinkable," I would rather say without analogy in experience, that a primal unity should

---

* "History of Creation." Vol. i. p. 8. Eng. Tran.
† "First Principles," p. 34. ‡ "Scientific use of the Imagination," p. 49.

have existed from eternity as a barren unity, and then at a point in time, however far back, begun to differentiate. A true development implies a *terminus a quo* as well as a *terminus ad quem*. If evolution is true, an absolute beginning, however unthinkable, is probable—*the eternity of matter is inconsistent with scientific evolution.*

(ii). And then as to *the human soul.* Even Dr. Pusey allows* that "theology does not hold the transformist theories excluded by Holy Scripture so that they spare the soul of man." The question of Creationism and Traducianism is indeed outside the limits of science. In the language of evolutionists it was a question of ontogeny, not phylogeny, and it dealt with the soul as a spiritual substance, which science cannot do. No doubt a man who could say, "I have swept the heavens with my telescope and I have found no God," would be capable of saying, "I have examined the human body with the microscope and have seen no soul." And he would have uttered another scientific platitude. But when the Church set its *imprimatur* on Creationism it plainly declared its belief that the difference between man and brute was *infinite.* The *infusio animae* implies at least this, that man as distinguished from the brute is in a conscious relation with God; that the animal nature of man, however close its affinity with the brute, is organic to spiritual powers and processes of which God Himself is the Object. The reality of those powers and processes, like the original creation of the world, is proved by methods other than those of positive science. It contributes nothing to the question for science to show that the human embryo is at a certain stage hardly distinguishable from the embryo of a brute, if each is what it will become, and the embryo of a brute will not become a man. And if it can be shown that historically man is developed from the anthropoid ape, it no more proves that he is nothing but an ape, which is the common and illogical conclusion, than does the phrase, "Dust thou art, and unto dust shall thou return" prove that man did not, by the will of God, become "a living soul."

The question, then, is narrowed down to this. Man is what he is, whether God's creative power proceeded by steps and "levels of creation," or by an "inclined plane." What, then, was the *modus creandi* which God employed in the creation of those various forms of being of which, on any showing, man is the highest? Of the "carpenter theory," over which some scientific men make merry, I will say nothing, but that it may be safely left to the defence of the Freemasons. We are, therefore, left to choose between what is technically known as *special creation*, the creation, that is, of species which have no intelligible relation to one another, and *evolution* or *derivation*. But *theology is bound up with neither.* The original creation of the world by God, as against any theory of emanation, is a matter of faith. The existence of the soul—*i.e.* the conscious relation of man with God,—lies at the root of all religion. Guard those two points, and they are both strictly beyond the range of inductive science, and for the rest, we are bound to concede to those who are spending their lives in reading for us God's revelation of Himself in nature, absolute

---

* Serm. "Unscience, not Science, adverse to Faith." p. 14.

freedom in the search, knowing that truth is mighty and must in the end prevail.

II. If we could be convinced that it is not evolution but the theories which unbelievers base upon it that are opposed to faith, it is surely wonderfully attractive in itself, and especially in our age. This is my second thesis. "By faith we believe that the worlds were framed by the word of God." So much He has revealed to us. But how He wrought, and what was (I say it reverently) the plan on which He wrought, this He has left us to discover from the work itself. More than that, He has implanted in us a principle which will not rest till it has asked and answered the question, How? and Why? So imperious is this instinctive tendency to relate God's acts to one another, and to find a meaning in them, that the very thing which science, by its own cautious methods, is slowly and surely doing, the common reason of common men, from the mere fact that reason is a relation-giving impulse, is doing unmethodically. In uncritical days, before reason learns to distrust itself, the relations it establishes, the explanations it accepts, are childish and anthropomorphic. Though they may claim and even get the sanction of religion, they are often "fond things vainly invented and grounded upon no warranty of Scripture, but rather repugnant to the Word of God." Such was the view of that great philosopher of old, who, in sheer despair of finding the harmony, the rational unity, which he sought in the discordances of nature, likened God to a child playing at draughts. Such was the view of those who in scholastic days thought to see the mind of God reflected in the little world of their own purposes and plans. And such is the view of those now who, like the Jews of Christ's time, attempt to explain the mystery of suffering and pain by rough-and-ready theories of Divine retributions. But we are living in agnostic days, when reason seems to be disappointed and baffled in the search for God; and the great and pressing need is, not to teach men the limits of human knowledge, but to restore the belief that real knowledge, the knowledge of God and His working, is possible. And evolution is doing this. We may not forget that the very man who formulated for us the doctrine of an unknowable God is spending his life in showing us that God is knowable, is revealing Himself to us in nature in language that we can understand. It is we, the theologians and the clergy, who are preaching an unknowable God, when we think to magnify Him by showing that He is unintelligible. *Credo quia non rationale* is but little removed from *Credo quia absurdum.*

We talk about *the unity of Nature* and the *Divine plan.* We talk about *the Omnipotence and Omnipresence of God.* See those truths as they are illumined by recent discoveries which have been made under the guidance of the evolution clue. See how the vegetable and the animal kingdom work into one another, each modified by the other, each perfected by the other. All the division of labour, which has been necessary in the study of nature, has only brought out more wonderfully than ever the *unity of nature.** Where is the line which once separated the chemistry of organic and inorganic matter? Where is the line which once separated the animal which could assimilate foreign

* Cf. Sir James Paget's address on "Theology and Science." Rivingtons, 1881.

substances, and the plant which, it was supposed, could not? There are gaps in our knowledge yet. The problem of archibiosis or archigony is not solved. The balance of scientific authority is against the origin of life from dead matter. And there are, positively, people who cling to this gap in our knowledge as if it were the stronghold of faith. Yet St. Thomas Aquinas believed in what is now called archibiosis, and it did not shake his faith.

Then think of what we now know of *the unity of the Divine plan.* See how the science of embryology has lighted up that mystery of "how the bones do grow in the womb of her that is with child." The fact that man is in his embryonic history, a microcosm of the lower creation, while yet he is, what he is, greater than all, is a new proof of the unity of the Divine plan, and the unity of nature is significant of the unity of God. The unity and intelligibility of nature are indeed correlative terms. You destroy its unity, just in so far as you destroy its intelligibility. Not that either the intelligibility, or the unity of nature, is proved by science. They are *assumed*, and the assumption is the grand initial act of faith with which science starts. Even where, as yet, we have failed to understand God's working, the motive power of science is its unwavering faith in the essential kinship of man with Nature, and the ultimate intelligibility of that which St. Paul did not shrink from calling τὸ γνωστὸν τοῦ θεοῦ—that which is knowable of God in the world of visible things.

Once more, it is a platitude with theologians that there is no such thing *as chance in nature*—nothing that is outside the hand of God. Read that truth in all its universality and minuteness as it is set forth in the doctrine of evolution. Not the shape or texture of a leaf, not the colour of a petal in a flower, not the delicate and ever varied pencilling of the butterfly's wing, not the form and habits of some beast of prey, but has its meaning, its essential causal relationship with the environment, the universe of God.

I see not what there is in the theory of special creations which we can set off against these things. That theory refers everything immediately to the will of God. Yes, but in doing so it makes that will, if not irrational, autocratic, arbitrary, unintelligible. It is like the pious confession of ignorance with which we are familiar in the verdict of a coroner's jury—"Died by the visitation of God." Every death is the visitation of God, and it is not less so because we can interpret God's action in the light of His other works.

If some scientific men who believe not in our faith have used the doctrine of evolution as a lever against Christianity, it is neither necessary nor wise for Christian men to blame evolution as the cause. We may learn a lesson from a little-read page of mediæval history. When in the thirteenth century the Arabian heretics brought the Aristotelian logic and metaphysics to bear against the faith of Christendom, the Church wisely removed the prohibition which rested on the works of the great Pagan; St. Thomas Aquinas fought the Mahometans with their own weapons, and Aristotle appeared as the Christian philosopher. Is it too much to believe that the time will come when we shall see in evolution, modified perhaps by wider knowledge, conditioned certainly by truths drawn from another sphere, a fuller revelation in nature than now seems possible for man, of the wonderful works of God?

PACIFIC
LIBRARY

ADDRESSES.

The Rev. Professor Pritchard, D.D., Oxford.

Resigning myself, as in duty bound, to the wisdom of our Subjects Committee, I proceed to accomplish the happy dispatch by attempting the impossible. We have heard of "half-hours with the Poets," and even "half-hours with the Stars," but it has been reserved for me to exhaust myself on fifteen minutes with the Theologians and the Evolutionists. I propose then, as the least unsatisfactory method of self-immolation, to compress as best I may, the convictions of a long life into a few sentences expressed as Apothegms or Queries, after the manner of the illustrious authors of *Guesses at Truth*.

Accordingly I ask:—Is it not possible that we Christians subject ourselves to needless anxiety by attempting to reconcile, in any literal sense, the earlier chapters of Genesis with the logical conclusions drawn from other sources of knowledge? Admitting, as we all here do, the existence of a divine element of inspiration, both as regards the Record, and its influence on the minds of the recorders, ought we not, in the absence of a distinct definition of the term, to be especially cautious that we do not attribute a character, an extent, or an intention to the Divine illumination which it does not claim for itself? Ought we not to bear in mind also, that the Universal Father, in His government of the world, does not appear to communicate to us His children, information which He has placed within the reach of the faculties with which He has endowed us?

Again, bearing in mind the visions of Ezekiel and St. John, whereby they were permitted to pierce the thin veil, which is all that separates the seen from the unseen, may we not regard it as supposable (I only say supposable), that, in the days of old, there was in like manner, accorded to some devout and favoured Seer, a succession of visions (whether in the darkness of the night, or in the brightness of noon), wherein he saw a Divine panorama of the Creation pass before him? Seven times is the curtain lifted up, and seven times it descends, and to him the darkness and the light are as the darkness and the light of the evening and the morning of seven successive days? Within his mind entranced, he hears the Divine command "Let there be light," and there was light. With his "mind's eye," he sees the heavens and the earth come into existence at the Word of the Lord; he hears the command, and they "stand fast." Into man, in some mysterious way, there is breathed the breath of the Lord, and he becomes a living soul, after the image of God. But, after all, shall we forget that this was, or may have been, a Vision: the enactment of a Divine majestic Parable? Nor ought we to overlook the fact, that had the unclouded, the absolute truth of the creative process been revealed to the ancient sage, that unclouded truth would have been unintelligible: unintelligible, not to him alone, in those days of the world's infancy, but beyond the grasp of the keenest philosopher of modern times. Enough for him to be reminded by authority from on high that it was God, who, in the beginning, formed the plan of the universe, and laid the foundations of the heavens and the earth; it was God who breathed into man the breath of life. If the knowledge of more than this be desired, resort is to be had to the loyal use of man's natural endowments.

It is by thoughts such as these, that, in all questions of science, the mind of the Christian may remain at peace with itself. Under the view of the Mosaic record which I have suggested, there can be no real conflict between Science and Religion, so long as a Divine Originator is in any sense admitted. The Christian is thereby placed in an attitude to listen to all new discoveries, not only without apprehension or

misgiving, but with a feeling of reverential gratitude to the Eternal Father for thus endowing His children with a patience so surprising, and an intellect so piercing. Thus if I am told that from a mere vesicle endued with that wondrous principle called life, or from some low molluscous organism attached to a sea-weed—(Mr. Darwin points to an Ascidian as an ancestor of the human family)—if I am told there have arisen a series of accidental variations in these inconspicuous shreds of life; which, acted on by their environments, and by the constant survival of the fittest, and without the interference of any guiding mind, or any other external aid, have, in the course of ages upon ages, developed, *not* into a Crocodile, which would be wonderful enough, but into a human being; nay, culminated in a Plato, a Paul, a Shakespeare, a Newton, —and all this process (be it re-stated), going on without external assistance—I say, that when I am told this wonderful tale of the origin of species through evolution, then, I am staggered, not at any contrariety with the sacred records, not at the alleged simplicity of the scheme, but I am staggered at the inconceivably complex character of the endowments of the molecules, which, from such low beginnings, have inevitably and of necessity, led to so unexpected, so magnificent a result. I confess that this machinery, as the scheme of nature, baffles and exceeds all my credulity, natural and acquired. The demand on my credulity may count but for little; but the amazing demand for unlimited successions of time exceeds what other branches of science tell me the treasury of time has contained. When I first heard of this bold hypothesis, which ignores the noblest part of man's history, and which to me seems to make little account of what we know regarding the elements of time, and the intensities of the forces, my mind at once reverted to that part of nature which it had been my lot to study with the closest attention. I refer to the structure of the human eye, under its mathematical aspects. As an optical instrument, the human eye is admitted to be utterly and hopelessly beyond the power of the Optician to imitate. There are inter-relations of lenses of unique forms, and of varying densities, placed at varying distances, surrounded by different media, and the whole is connected with an automatic machinery essential to the formation of exact images of external objects at all sorts of distances. If any one of these numerous elements becomes deranged, it would not be in the power of the most skilful optician to explain the mode of setting it right, still less would he be able to improve it. And yet we are asked to believe that, throughout the ages, successions of accidental variations have been going on, and that by means of the "survival of the fittest," this marvellous instrument has been gradually developed from a mere film, sensitive to light, up to that exquisitely beautiful organ which connects us with the glories and utilities and sympathies of the external world around us, piercing, be it observed, from a microscopic atom to the infinitude of the stars. Surely as well might you place the necessary letters of many alphabets into a huge pepper box, and expect to dredge them out into the arrangement in the *Principia* of Newton. Here then lay my difficulty, which I ventured to urge upon the attention of Mr. Darwin, with whom at the time I was connected in certain close relations. The reply of that great naturalist was characteristic and remarkable. It was to this effect: "I have not a fault to find with a word that you say; you pay me such handsome compliments, while you press me so hard. With regard to the human eye, I confess I have a difficulty." With me that difficulty still remains, and until it is removed I shall be unable to accept, without great reserve, the fascinating hypothesis of the evolution of species by "Natural Selection." To me it wears the aspect of one of those half-truths, which in the history of the progress of human knowledge, have played so important a part, as the precursors of more accurate theories. Meantime we wait.

But, after all, there is a deep debt of gratitude which men of cultivated intellect owe to Mr. Darwin; and there is also a view of evolution which to the Christian is dear

to him as is his life. A very few words on these two points, if the fifteen minutes hold out, and I shall conclude.

For my own part I daily and consciously feel, that I owe a large portion of my intellectual happiness, as no doubt others do, to what Mr. Darwin has taught me. I say nothing of his grand disclosure of the building up of continents by the agency of coral insects. You are in fairy land when Mr. Darwin (as a Magician) takes you by the hand among the Atols. But more than this, when I stand by the side of a lythrum, an orchid, a primrose, and through Mr. Darwin's exposition, get a sight of the wondrous mechanism, and the curious adaptations, which secure the growth, the permanence, the beauty of the exquisite gems of life before me, then by an irresistible impulse, I uncover my head as in the presence of the activities of powers, the origin of which I cannot but believe to be Divine.

Lastly, is not the Christian himself also the subject of a law of evolution? Are there not "variations," I may not call them "accidental variations," in the discipline of his life, in his temper, in his opportunities, in the habits of his thoughts? And are there not the interactions of his environment in the unseen, guiding, loving, fostering Hand? Are there not ministers seen and unseen, sent to minister to his moral health? And is there not the permanent survival of the fittest, and the secure promise that he may improve and improve in righteousness, until at length he becomes the true servant and child of God, dwelling in the light and the love of his Father's home?

F. Le Gros Clark, Esq., F.R.S.

Natural Science and Revelation have, as their common object, the manifestation of truth: but in one respect they offer a noticeable contrast. Science advances by slow and cautious steps, feeling for light amid the prevailing obscurity, and sometimes deluded by an imaginary gleam, and led astray: whereas the Word of God is complete in its revelation of all that its Author intends to disclose; containing, indeed, avowed mysteries transcending man's comprehension, but comprising in plain and intelligible language all that it is necessary he should be acquainted with for the chief purpose of his existence, the discipline of his life and the salvation of his soul.

It is needless to point out how much mischief has been inflicted on revealed religion by earnest defenders of the faith, (whose zeal has exceeded their discretion and their learning) in their attempts to reconcile that which is irreconcilable, by striving to establish harmony between the partial glimpses we have of natural truth, and the perfect knowledge we possess in the revealed Word of the Author of all Truth. The reaction of such ill-timed and incautious defence has been prejudicial to religion: it has not stayed the progress of scientific research, but has stimulated opposition on the part of its disciples, whose efforts, by a natural antagonism, have been directed to pulling down the barrier which had been so unwisely raised to obstruct their progress or to discredit their pursuits. To this hostility, and a perception of its injurious influence on religion, I apprehend we may owe, in some measure, the awakening of the centres of education to the value of scientific training, and the necessity of providing instruction in the various branches of natural science. Be that as it may, it is a change fraught with incalculable advantage in every way, and especially in the interest of religion, by neutralising prejudice, and fostering sympathy between those whose pursuits have hitherto led them to view the same subject from such different standpoints, and thus to arrive at antagonistic conclusions.

It has been the destiny of every startling innovation on received opinions to excite opposition. In a certain sense this is wholesome. But there has been and is much needless expenditure of energy in resisting what men *believe* to be erroneous, and in upholding that which they believe to be true. The triumph of truth is certain, notwithstanding the restless conflicts respecting it. And these contentions very often exist, not because of any demonstrable incongruity between a scientific discovery and revealed truth, but because such discovery does not harmonise with the objector's preconceived notions, or does not come within the scope of his understanding. This injudicious opposition was exemplified by the bitter controversy and tyrannous oppression which the earlier discoveries in astronomy generated. Yet no one now considers the stability of Revelation endangered because the earth is no longer regarded as the centre of the universe. The angry recriminations which had their origin in geological discoveries may be in the memory of some of my hearers : but further examination of the questions under discussion has shown that here also the conflict of opinions admits of being reconciled by the adoption of a less literal and restricted interpretation of the Mosaic account of the Creation than that which had been previously familiar to us ; and by giving due weight to the consideration that a revelation, declared in the language of modern science, would have been simply unintelligible at the time it was written. But, although it behoves the theologian to examine dispassionately whatever may be advanced by the scientist, it cannot be denied that the difficulty of arriving at a satisfactory solution of apparent inconsistencies is enhanced by defective information on both sides : for it is exceptionally the case that the expert in science is also a theological scholar, or that the theologian is versed in natural science ; and the training of the one prompts him to attach a weight to authority, which is rejected by the other in favour of observation : yet each may, perchance, consider himself qualified to deal with both sides of a disputed question.

I have said that the aim of scientific research is truth ; and the natural consequence of this feeling after truth is to quicken our perceptive power and to enlarge our knowledge, thus enabling us to embrace more of detail in one comprehensive whole : and this generalisation implies a nearer approach to the final cause. Ought we to be surprised and disappointed that our view of a landscape is defective before we have reached a sufficient height to see its various component elements, and thus to correct our fallacious estimate of their relative distance and proportions ? We should rather welcome every advancing step which brings us nearer to our desired resting-place, although at times the path may seem to lead us from it. It is in this spirit, as it appears to me, that the believer in Revelation should accept the progress of discovery in natural science : that is, in a firm persuasion that each successive unveiling of natural agency,—every combination of previously observed phenomena in one comprehensive category, and subject to one uniform law, is an advance towards the first cause of all :—and also convinced that, with more perfect knowledge, we shall be enabled to discern the harmony which *must* exist between the Word and Works of God.

But, it has been objected that it is unphilosophical to assume that there is an intelligent First Cause and design in creation. Nevertheless, it cannot be denied that the principle of the conditions of existence, or, as it is commonly called, of *Final Causes*, has exercised a vast influence on the progress of biology. Even those who undervalue or reject teleology are insensibly compelled to avail themselves of its suggestive help. This principle in natural science, involving *à priori* considerations, was advocated by Cuvier in the early part of this century, and strongly opposed by his contemporary, Geoffroy St. Hilaire :—the former maintaining the doctrine of

design in organisation, and the latter altogether repudiating it, and especially guarding himself, with the humility of agnosticism, against the imputation of ascribing any intention in creation to God; whilst he endeavoured to establish the—as it then appeared—opposing doctrine of unity in the organic plan of the animal kingdom. These eminent zoologists present us with typical examples of the advocates of these doctrines, which had so wide-spread an influence in their time and subsequently. I speak of them as opposing doctrines because they were so regarded by their several partisans; and the contention was sufficiently sharp to produce, for a time, a coolness between Cuvier and St. Hilaire.

I have no intention of discussing the respective merits of their views, but refer to them rather to show that there is no real antagonism between them, and that they exemplify the relation which accepted or disputed theories may hold to each other, when included under a higher and more comprehensive generalisation. But such fresh discovery is not to be regarded as negativing those inferences which had been previously accepted. We see, for example, that certain phenomena have an evident association with some beneficial result, and are satisfied to rest on this relation as direct cause and effect; but, by and by, we discover that the phenomena in question are referable to a law which had no relation to this beneficial result: yet it is no reason for rejecting our first conclusion because the second is also true. The tawny hue of the lion, the spots of the leopard, and the stripes of the tiger, although claimed as exemplifying the principle of the survival of the fittest, are no less beneficial to their respective owners, by concealing them on the arid desert, amid the leafy tree branches, or in the tangled jungle. If this be so, are we justified in refusing to believe that, because it has pleased the Designer of the universe to accomplish His purposes through the instrumentality of certain fixed laws, the beneficial results of those laws, and uniformity in plan of the observed outcome of their operation were not a part of the design, or that our failure to discover the adaptation of means to an end is a reason for assuming the absence of such purpose? I think not. It rather behoves us to wait patiently whilst we work, instead of rashly assuming that we have already reached the limits of generalisation, or that this newly-discovered law is to be accepted as exclusively explanatory of all the phenomena in the investigation of which we are engaged.

The doctrine of organic Evolution seems to me to illustrate these remarks. If we adopt it in its integrity, we are not, therefore, compelled to deny the principle of Design, or even that of Unity of Type. There is no necessary inconsistency in these doctrines, though we may admit that the higher and more comprehensive law is that which has been most recently advanced. I do not propose to discuss in detail this doctrine as applied to living organisms; but simply to glance at its present aspect in relation to revealed truth, and its acknowledged claims on our consideration.

I may remark, in passing, that the questions of spontaneous generation and the origin of life are not reached by Evolution. Especially since the grand advance in physical science by the discovery of the conservation and convertibility of force, an opinion has been entertained by some biologists that vital phenomena are due to a combined operation of physical and chemical agents: but neither facts nor reasoning have sufficed to discredit the generally received view that vitality is an inherited endowment *sui generis*, or to sustain a belief in spontaneous generation.

Biologists seem to be almost unanimous in adopting, though not without reservation in some instances, the leading facts and reasoning of Darwin; by whom it is affirmed or implied that the law of Evolution will ultimately suffice, with its supplementary conditions, to explain all the complex and varied phenomena of organic form and function. An analogous claim has been asserted, not infrequently,

on behalf of other discoveries, and has been maintained by their authors and advocates with pertinacity, until subsequent investigation has demonstrated the fallacy of a too hasty generalisation. No doubt the advance in biology, which is due to the writings of Wallace, Darwin, and others of the same school, is great: but, on strictly scientific grounds, it is assuming more than the theory of Evolution is entitled to, when so much is exacted on its behalf.

The special feature of this doctrine is, that all living organisms are derived from one common source, and that their varied forms are due to Natural Selection, through a long and uninterrupted series of changes, and that each organism is influenced solely by its existing demands in relation to its environment. The evolutionist who refuses to recognise design in the development of his system—and there are such—is bound to supply a more rational explanation of the initiative activity of protoplasm, and the diversified bias of cell-development, culminating in adaptations of organic structure to function, and to beneficial extrinsic arrangements which meet him at every turn. Such perverse rejection of Divine purpose in no way strengthens the Evolution theory; for, as already remarked, the explanatory sufficiency of one principle, if admitted, does not invalidate the other:—their parallel manifestation presents no difficulty, and their divorce is, to say the least, gratuitous. Moreover, it may be observed that the atheist alone can consistently refuse his assent to design in Creation; for our conception of a Supreme Being is inseparably allied with Power, Knowledge, and Will; and the suggestion that these attributes have been exercised haphazard and without plan or intention is inadmissible. How existing results have been worked out, whether by prolonged steps through incalculable ages or instantaneously, does not affect this question. Neither the lapse of countless centuries, nor the struggle for life, nor inheritance, nor natural or sexual selection, in any degree weaken, far less subvert, the doctrine of final causes. But if the initiative agency of creative intelligence be admitted, it seems unreasonable to limit the sphere of that agency. It is true that the universe is governed through laws which are not subject to variation; and we know also that organic life is developed and maintained in accordance with similar laws: but it is no controversion of these laws—it may be, for aught we know, a necessary part of them—if a fresh impetus or direction is imparted to certain forces, which is productive of different results.

Again, the law of Evolution excludes the idea of creative *interference;* yet the question of such interposition, in certain stages of the world's history, may not unreasonably be weighed against the ingenious assumptions which Evolution, in its plenary acceptation, is compelled to advance, as data for its bold conclusions: it is a balance of probabilities; and I am not disposed to quarrel with those who prefer to rest in the belief in such interposition, rather than, with our present light, to build on scientific conjecture, and to force the facts we witness to range themselves under the despotic law of Evolution. The lapse of time claimed for this doctrine is such (to use Darwin's words) as to be "utterly inappreciable by the human intellect;" and the record of geology is far too imperfect to satisfy its requirements; "for the number of specimens in all our museums (I again quote the same author—*O. of Sp.* 548—) is as nothing compared with the countless generations of countless species which certainly have existed." *Certainly*, I may remark, if the theory be accepted without reservation; yet this geological defect is an admitted difficulty; for we ought, in order to make this evidence complete, to connect the broken links, to fill up the blanks, and to find "great piles of strata of organic remains long before the lowest bed of the Silurian system was deposited."

The evolution of the Eye seems to have struck Darwin as embarrassing: and it

certainly is not easy to appreciate the utility of this organ during its lengthened period of incubation or progressive development, and therefore of optical imperfection. But this serves to exemplify a class of difficulties which are met by the argument—more satisfactory in most instances than in that of this special sense—that the partially developed state of its various organic components was, in each successive stage, in conformity with, and adapted to, the existing constitution and requirements of the whole.

Of *Man*, as the culmination of organic Revolution, I have a few words to say.

We should dismiss, as unworthy of a philosophical spirit of research, the prejudice engendered by the assumed alliance claimed for us with the anthropoid apes. If the consanguinity had been traced to some nobler animal the popular objection would probably have been less. It really matters not whether we are descended from such ancestors or were formed out of the dust of the ground, if we feel that God was our creator, and intended us to be what we are.

This final step in Evolution is regarded by many biologists as an essential sequel—a logical necessity, if we accept the earlier teaching and the other propositions of the doctrine.

Science and Revelation agree in assigning to Man the final place in the order of existence: and that he was once gifted with a spirit of purity, holiness and love, in the likeness of his Divine Creator, is a revealed truth which no scientific speculation can set aside without rejecting Revelation. Immortality is beyond the reach of evolution: the lapse of millions of years is no approach to an eternal future: and our instinctive shrinking from annihilation, the value we place on our personal identity, and the natural yearning of the heart for a higher and better estate and a more durable existence, though outside the range of physical enquiry, cannot be ignored. If man, therefore, is immortal, this endowment must have been conferred, and could not have been otherwise acquired. Granting this gift, it is difficult to escape the inference that moral responsibility was associated with it, as a necessary adjunct. Even conceding the possibility that Man's *intellectual* attributes might be evolved from the corresponding faculties of animals, an admission of his immortality and responsibility renders it not unreasonable to believe that his intellectual endowment was also a direct gift from his Creator. Apart from any qualifying considerations the question is again one of balance of probabilities. But there are many such considerations which seem to throw the weight in favour of direct endowment. I will not contrast Man's intellect with that of animals: this is a familiar subject; and, although observation has induced me to allow a higher position to animal intelligence than is generally conceded, it appears to me that there is so impassable a barrier between them, so wide a chasm without a bridge, that the doctrine of Evolution, as here employed, is unsatisfactory. I will mention only one difficulty, which has its bearing also on physical evolution: and that possesses the greater weight, by being placed at the head of what the principle of natural selection *cannot* do, by one who styles himself its "ardent advocate." The capacity of the skull, and therefore the size of the brain, is an unquestioned measure of intelligence, not only in contrasting Man with the lower animals, but in comparing man with man;—reference being made specially to the development of the cerebral hemispheres in relation to general bulk, and some allowance being conceded for quality and complexity of arrangement. Yet Wallace has pointed out that, in our largest collections of national skulls, the variation in capacity is comparatively trivial; and—which is more to the purpose, that the most ancient skulls closely resemble those of the existing race of man; that the probable contemporary of the mammoth and cave-bear had, to use Professor Huxley's words, "a fair average skull, which might have belonged to a philosopher,

or might have contained the thoughtless brains of a savage." And this development was co-existent, apparently, with savage habits, as suggested by the strong ridges on the jaw and other bones, indicating great muscular strength. In comparing the brain capacity of the anthropoid ape with that of man, savage and civilised, the proportionate quantitative measurements given are 10 for the ape, 26 for the savage, and 32 for civilised man. The largest specimen of the gorilla yet known had a brain of 34½ cubic inches: yet, any adult male skull with less than 65 cubic inches of brain, or measuring less than 19 inches in circumference can belong only to an idiot. It is with no surprise then that we find Mr. Wallace, in this very interesting chapter of his work on *Natural Selection*, arriving at the only conclusion admissible from these premisses, that, in his large and well-developed brain, the savage "possesses an organ quite disproportionate to his actual requirements,—an organ that seems prepared in advance only to be fully utilised as he progresses in civilisation;" and which "seems to prove the existence of some power, distinct from that which has guided the development of the lower animals through their ever-varying forms of being." Such is his reasoning and such his verdict. No less interesting and instructive are the same author's remarks on the denuded body, the erect posture, the form of the feet and hands, and the voice of man; in the existence and distinctive characters of all which he recognises the insufficiency of natural selection.

If this be so, we may ask whence came these human characteristics, and how was it that man acquired a brain of useless size and complexity; and how came it to pass that he preserved it when his surroundings and requirements ought, according to the principle of natural selection, but retrogressively, to have degraded him in the scale of creation? There is a close resemblance, both organic and functional, as well as developmental, between Man and other vertebrata; and analogy seems to point to the conjectural inference that he must be the culmination of a system which, without him, would be incomplete. But as yet this assumption rests on no reliable evidence. I therefore think it must be admitted that Evolution has no *present* scientific pretension, which can be regarded as admissible, to include Man, morally, mentally or physically, in its vast and varied family. I might even venture further by saying that the early history of man, so far as yet revealed to us by science might, not unnaturally, induce in some minds a distrust in a theory which is compelled to rest so much on surmise and possibilities. The failing proof may be furnished at some future day, and we may await patiently and fearlessly what that future shall unfold.

Recent attempts have been made, with some success, to show that the Divinely dictated account, or retrospective vision of the creation, by Moses, permits of an interpretation much more in conformity with astronomical discoveries and geological record than was formally supposed; and therefore with the doctrine of Evolution, so far as it is supported by geology. Even if time permitted, and my acquaintance with these sciences qualified me for the task, it would be beside the special purpose of this address to discuss such speculations, which, we may anticipate, will assume a more definite form and higher value as the circle of our information expands. Moreover, I should be sanctioning that which I have already deprecated, by a premature attempt to harmonise revelation with a branch of natural science, which, though opening up a large field for study, and a valuable guide in biological research, is still too defective in its data and hypothetical in its reasoning to justify its erection into an exclusive system, claiming finality, and resting on the assumed lapse of countless ages, and to which investigation in other directions can be only ancillary, and must be subordinate.

And here I might close this address, but that it seems desirable I should indicate, in a few words, the salient points to which I have desired to draw attention.

The recognition of a purpose in Creation and of Unity of Type in development is in no way inconsistent with the adoption of the theory of Evolution, which includes both teleology and morphology in its more comprehensive embrace: and this proposition is sustained by the moral certainty of such purpose existing; as the conception of an Omniscient and Omnipotent Creator, working without plan or design, is a paradox. Moreover, an initiative scheme, including periodical creative acts, is not incompatible with a belief in intervening organic progress by evolution; though I cannot say that such a hypothesis commends itself to my reason or to my conception of the Divine perfection. It implies supplemental agency, and therefore initiative insufficiency, thus degrading the Divine attributes to the level of our own finite capacities and limited resources. I would rather contemplate the possibility of our being permitted some day to reach a higher standpoint, whence we may see and understand that which is now shut out from our view and unintelligible; a further step, possibly, in generalisation, which shall manifest yet more of the glory of our Heavenly Father, and thus draw us nearer to Himself. But, be that as it may—and I am sensible how fruitless are such speculations—it appears to me that the theory of Creation we have been considering, resting on its own demonstrable evidence, tends in the most direct way to support the view, that the outcome of this world's creation, with all its complex machinery and wondrous arrangement, both organic and inorganic, must have been planned from the beginning; that its harmonious evolution was foreseen and predestined when the earth was without form and void; and that all proceeded on a fixed and unerring plan, in subservience to laws which imply a lawgiver. And is not our conception of the power and wisdom of the Creator exalted rather than impaired by such a contemplation? It were indeed presumptuous to contrast one mode of action with another in the Omnipotent Author of all: yet, to our finite apprehension, the progressive evolution, in accordance with a fixed law, of animal life in its varied forms, till they attained their existing perfection of structure and special organisation and relative adaptation to their surroundings, seems to attest a Creator's attributes with even more convincing force, than if the same results had been accomplished at once, in their completeness, by His simple fiat. And surely the devout Christian may welcome, with unshrinking confidence, the light which thus manifests His power and goodness, as another streak in the dawn of a still distant day, when creation's hymn shall be sung without a jarring note of discord.

God said in the beginning, "Let there be light;" and He encourages us to seek for, and to live in the fruition of, that light, spiritually and intellectually as well as materially. It is certain that the shadow of fallibility *must* ever rest on man's pursuits; and the perversion of partial knowledge *may*, for a season, obscure the truth. But, as the mists of early morn are scattered by the rising sun, so may we hopefully anticipate that these transient clouds will be dissipated by fuller revelations and a more perfect knowledge, till shadows vanish in the light that "shineth more and more unto the perfect day."

DISCUSSION.

The Right Rev. Bishop Perry.

I wish to say a few words upon this subject. It is, I conceive, an undoubted fact that some of the alleged recent advances in natural science—for instance, the antiquity of man and the doctrine of evolution, which were mentioned by the Bishop of

Carlisle—have greatly disturbed the minds of many religious persons. They have shaken the faith of weak Christians, have confirmed doubters in their unbelief, and put a weapon into the hands of scoffers against the truths of Christianity. At the same time it must always be borne in mind that religion has nothing to fear in the end from true science. The discoveries of astronomy and geology have long been recognised as certain facts; and although at first the minds of many were troubled by them, yet all Christians have long since been thoroughly satisfied that they are perfectly consistent with the truths of Christian revelation. The question therefore now to be determined is whether these alleged advances in science are or are not true; whether they are science or are only falsely so called. This is what I want particularly to impress upon my scientific friends, such as some of those who have spoken to-day. It is not, at the present time, as it seems to me, our proper object to reconcile these alleged facts with truths of revelation—not to show that the doctrine respecting the antiquity of man, or the doctrine of evolution, is consistent with the statements of Scripture—but to ascertain whether these doctrines are really founded on well ascertained facts, and derived from those facts by sound inferential reasoning. I do not hesitate to say, notwithstanding the statement of Professor Flower, that the theory of evolution is not now universally accepted. I do not myself think that it rests upon any scientific foundation whatever. As was very properly said by a speaker just now, it is a balance of probabilities and nothing more; and to my own mind I confess it is most improbable.

In the examination of the truth of one of these doctrines, the antiquity of man, or evolution, I think we ought to put revealed religion for the time entirely out of sight, and argue the question altogether upon those principles which are agreed upon by both parties—the being of a God, who is the Almighty and all-wise Creator of the universe, and the universality and permanence of the laws of the material world.

In some cases we should find, I conceive, the alleged facts to be extremely doubtful. For instance, with regard to the cave at Brixham, I do not believe that that cave contains a *magazine of flint knives*, accumulated there by a people in a state of barbarism. I do not think that such a thing is possible; and I have listened to a very interesting lecture in which the lecturer satisfied me that these so-called knives were the natural cleavage of the flint. I do not doubt that such knives were used, but I do not believe that the cave at Brixham contained a magazine of them. So with regard to the alleged successive ages of stone, and bronze, and iron; I do not believe that such ages existed in the history of mankind; generally, I do not believe that any people have ever thus grown out of a state of utter barbarism into a state of comparative civilisation. There is no instance in history of any nation which has so grown up. These several allegations appear to me not proved.

I am now only expressing an opinion, for it would be impossible in the few minutes allowed me to argue the matter at length. What I desire is that one of our scientific men, such as Professor Pritchard, who does not believe in these theories, would publish some popular work explaining distinctly what the assertions are, and upon what grounds they are said to rest; and then pointing out either the improbability of the alleged facts, or the unsoundness of the reasoning upon them.

With regard to evolution, which has formed the chief subject of the papers and speeches this afternoon, I would observe that, assuming, what all the evolutionists acknowledge, the being of a God, the question is whether He in the first instance created separately all the various races of animals which exist at the present time, or created them (for they would still be His creation) by a continuous course of evolution—one species growing out of another, until the world was filled with all these races. Now, if God created them by such a course of successive evolution, the law by which they were successively evolved must still be in force, for, as I have already remarked, all acknowledge that there has been no alteration in the laws of nature since the creation of the world; the process of evolution must therefore be going on now. But we have no proof of this. We see, indeed, many wonderful instances of evolution, as, for example, during the spring and the summer, in the growth of the seed into the stalk, and the forming of the grain from the stalk; in the budding and blossoming of the trees, and the evolving of the fruit from the blossom. We all believe in this kind of evolution, because it is going on around us every year. We cannot explain the cause of it, but we see that the law is a continuous law in operation at the present time. Again, besides the ordinary propagation of animals, we have a most remarkable instance of evolution in the moth, the egg of which becomes a caterpillar, the caterpillar subsequently a grub, and then the grub another moth. All these are instances of an evolution of which no one doubts, because in them the law of nature is seen to be regularly operating from year to year. But there is no instance of

any law of nature now operating for the evolution of one species of animals from another.

Again, regarding the theory of evolution simply as a matter of probability, think of the numberless varieties which exist in the animal world, from the smallest insect to the huge elephant. Think also of the numerous minute differences between animals of nearly the same kind, such as the dog and the cat, which I have mentioned on a former occasion. These are two quadrupeds which, while they have much in common with each other, differ in a multitude of particulars. The cat purrs, the dog barks. The cat catches its prey in a peculiarly stealthy manner; the dog in quite a different manner. Each manifests its pleasure in a different way. As has been remarked by an eminent naturalist, since dead, they have each a singular contrary characteristic; the cat, so soon as it gets the power over its prey, holds it down, and for some time does not hurt it; the dog, on the other hand, will at once worry it to death. Hence, if you are contending with any animal of the feline race, when you find you can do no more, you should lie perfectly still; the animal will not hurt you for a time, and you may have a chance of escape. On the contrary, when attacked by a savage dog, you should fight on to the very last, for as soon as he gets the mastery he will worry you to death.

I cannot now pursue this argument. I will only repeat my earnest desire that some of the many scientific men who are competent to the task would thoroughly examine the present popular theory of evolution on scientific principles, without any reference to revealed religion, and pronounce their opinion upon its truth. Afterwards, if their opinion is favourable, but not otherwise, let any one point out, if he can, its consistency with the Bible.

The Rev. C. Lloyd Engstrom, Secretary of the Christian Evidence Society, and Professor at the City of London College.

I am delighted to be able to declare that I am personally acquainted with many evolutionists, and that they are amongst the most sincere and earnest Christians that I know. This fact I consider to be a proof that there is no real discordance between evolution and Christianity. But scientific men are apt to use their faith in science a little too freely. Faith in Science, like Faith in religion, needs verifying. Professor Dawson, President of the American Association for the advancement of Science, has lately recommended to scientific men more moderation in their statements. This is the definition I would give of biological evolution:—"Evolution does not allow that present living forms, or their like ancestral forms, had come by a sudden making out of dead material." Now, there is nothing in this atheistic. Man and animals, all alike, came from a "jelly speck," yet after all there is God behind it; the jelly speck that is to develop into such wondrous form must have had a Creator. According to the definition I have given, I think all the leading men of science are in favour of evolution. Is it in conflict with the first chapter of Genesis? I think not. I found many difficulties as my mind roamed in the sphere of the phenomena of Christianity and the Bible, and again and again I found that the word evolution came into my thoughts as the possible solution of many of them. The evidence of biological evolution at present is very weak, and yet I think it will eventually be accepted as a scientific law. I do not agree with those who regard it as *monstrum horrendum, informe, ingens, cui lumen ademptum.* Earnest Christian men are being more and more persuaded that if evolution is accepted as true, it will add great strength to the proof that God made the world. I feel, however, that before the theory of continuity can be accepted, it must be modified by the introduction of the catastrophic element. The idea of leaps and bounds in the course of development must be admitted. Birth and death are both catastrophes. When this is admittted, then in the course of the evolution of man from a jelly speck can be found a stage at which it will still be true that God breathed into man's nostrils the breath of life, and he became a living soul.

The Rev. W. D. GROUND, Curate of Newburn, near Newcastle-on-Tyne.

IT will, I think, be allowed by all who have heard the papers and speeches this afternoon, and especially that able and beautiful paper by the Rev. Aubrey Moore, that this Congress has raised the whole matter in debate to a higher level than ever before, and has dealt with the scientific generalisation of evolution in a manner more worthy of Christian statesmen. For this I am profoundly thankful. For the past thirty years, evolution has confronted the Church of Christ—it has been reviled as materialistic, atheistic, puerile, opposed to facts, and I know not what besides; whilst a little band of theologians who have patiently examined the subject, of whom I claim to be one, have steadfastly maintained that evolution gives, on the contrary, a far higher conception of the power, wisdom, and glory of the Creator than the opposite view, and that it is an outlook on to a vaster area whose spaces supply a parallax wherewith to measure eternity. Now we are looking at the question like sensible men, and if this Congress accepts, as I think it does accept, these papers, then so far the victory is won. But now suffer me to point out that our work is by no means finished. There seems to be a disposition on the part of several of the speakers to swing to the other extreme, and to accept the theory *en bloc* without any adequate sense of what it involves. We do not want *revolution* in our modes of thought, but a just and orderly *evolution;* and evolution accepted without a complete change in our mental habitudes, means nothing less than an intellectual chaos. Let us make no mistake. To accept evolution is to accept an element of mental disintegration that will surely destroy every doctrine, theological and otherwise, that is not in accordance with it. It implies a new creation of our intellectual and moral universe. It implies, I hold, a far nobler and greater creation, a change like that Augustus made in Rome, which he found brick and left marble. But we must be prepared to find that every instance of design in our whole universe—the entire Kosmos, from the first patch of stardust to the limit of the inorganic, then it may be a leap, and then on from that point to the highest powers of the greatest man—is all included in the sweep of, is all explicable on the hypothesis of, this all-comprehending Law. Some of the speakers—notably Professor Pritchard—were unable to believe that an eye was fashioned by such means. Such an exception appears to me unphilosophical and improbable in the highest degree. Mr. Darwin has allowed the eye to be an unexplained difficulty, but Herbert Spencer has shown how light, acting on a sensitive spot in an organism, would slowly produce those modifications of structure which would result in an incipient eye, and how, as the environment around that nascent eye became greater, the higher powers and energies of vision would by successive small increments be superinduced. And even if by a superfine, and I think a supercilious criticism, Mr. Spencer be ruled to be beyond the scientific pale, yet let me remind you that Professor Huxley, President of the Royal Society, has expressed a similar opinion. He has stated his belief that the eye originates in a tactual appendage, something like a cat's whisker, which at first felt an object, and that by the sensations thus given, nervous currents were produced in the organism, and thus an eye was slowly built up; and he instances a crab's eye, which is evidently but a mere piece of the outer integument. Slowly, step by step, we must, I think, expect to find that every gap in the long evolution chain is being steadily filled up, and that this all-comprehending law is at least a *history* of the formation of the entire Kosmos. Herein comes the danger to our Christian faith. For Mr. Spencer has shown that all this can be accounted for on the one principle of the persistence of force, the principle, that is, that force exists, and that this force persists. Out of that he has got all the laws of logic, axioms of Euclid, the entire science of Mathematics, and probably also all the known principles of biology, and has accounted on this one principle alone for millions of facts in every department of science. Some may say there are millions still unexplained; there may be, but when millions *are* explained by one principle in all departments of research, no strong intellect can I think accept the proposition that that principle is not of universal application. A key which fits a million wards in an intricate lock, must be the key that was meant to fit it; either this must be true, or the whole science of probabilities is worthless. Our Christian faith then must be prepared at once, or in coming years, to confront and deal with this stupendous proposition, that one principle, the persistence of force, can account for the existence of everything that the eye can see, the balance weigh, the heart feel, the mind grasp. As the law of gravitation accounts for the stellar system, so this greater generalisation seems to account for all that comes within man's ken. And as yet this principle is not recognised as

either guided by intelligence or subordinated to moral ends. And this is the awful Frankenstein that men of strong vision can see looming dimly in the distance, the whole world explained by an unintelligent force, by a principle which leaves no room for God, Christ, heaven, the soul, conscience, faith, prayer, miracles—in a word, the whole world of the spiritual clean blotted out. To this the Rev. Aubrey Moore replies that there must have been a beginning. Yes there must. He also says that if man's body is an ascent from the lower animals, that militates nothing against the truth that man has an immortal soul. To a theologian it may so appear, but forgive me for replying, with all deference to the writer of such an able paper, that such a line of conduct opposes a barrier to scepticism that is flimsy in the extreme. If force once set going can account for all that is in our universe, can explain all the inorganic, and then, beginning again at the ascidians, can account for all powers up to those of a Shakespere, the proposition that there is in the world nothing more than unintelligent and unmoral force, it seems to me will appear to a mind not imbued with Theistic conceptions just as credible as that all things came from an intelligent Creator. Never will I consent to let our Christian faith rest on a defence so precarious ; it is conduct which seems to me to display a temerity that I cannot easily characterise, and if it be persisted in, I do not hesitate to denounce it as fool-hardy in the extreme. The bravest soldiers are just those who know when a position cannot be held, and if we rest content with such a defence, we shall find that the foes of our faith will slowly drive us vanquished before them. What then ought to be done to meet our need? This, it seems to me. We must set about constructing a philosophy of the Kosmos which shall be at once more comprehensive in grasp, more logical in arrangement, more accurate in detail, more strictly scientific—in one word, a deeper and more thoroughgoing explanation of all things—than any rival system now confronting us ; but we must make our whole system to be only the lines designed and followed by the great Creator. We must patiently find out the entire thought and plan of Christ, in nature and in Revelation, in science and in history, in art and in music, in every human empire, in the measured progress of the ages—in a word, in all things human ; we must set up His great thought ; we must fit His miracles into the scheme, we must incorporate with it the inspiration of the prophets, the power of apostles, the indwelling of the Holy Ghost in believers ; we must fit into it the prayers we offer every day, and the answers we get ; we must set in it the entire *corpus* of Revelation, the Atonement, Forgiveness, the Fall, the Resurrection ; we must show the spiritual and divine side of things, we must show, as I venture to say we can show, that the Cross of our Master Christ is the centre and explanation of all creation ; and then we must ask the leaders of thought, the magnates of science, the men of robust and powerful intellect, "Now which is the more logical and consistent scheme, which breaks least with probabilities—our Theistic philosophy, or the philosophy which gets all things out of unintelligent and unmoral force?" And if we fashion such a Philosophy on a worthy scale, I venture to predict that the intellectual superiority of our Theistic system shall appear as palpable as a mountain, and that we shall sway the common sense of our whole race to the side of God. But pardon me if I say there is no time to be lost. Every year we let pass we are losing ground. For this agnostic philosophy—the explanation of the universe in terms of force—has long confronted us, and whatever its defects, it is a far greater, a far more complete explanation of the universe than Theism can produce. As yet all Christendom has not put forth in modern times any scheme so great. Now we must not let this state of affairs continue. We must not allow our Bible to be dishonoured before it, because we have been hitherto, and are still, too little to grasp that Bible's statements—too little to grasp the vast spaces and times over which its single words extend. Science is showing us the dimensions of God's thoughts, and our theological edifices, if we knew the truth, are not large enough to contain His ideas. "God dwelleth not in temples made with hands," whether those hands be material or mental—hands properly so called, or constructive instruments fashioned out of the higher qualities of mind. Our present theistic systems of philosophy are a miserable degradation of His conception, and so they will continue until we fashion others on the scale given us by evolution. Until we do this the agnostic philosophy can utterly out-flank us. Bringing into a unity things as remote as an ascidian and a Shakespeare, any able agnostic, though he be only a youth, can out-flank and out-general the greatest of our divines, just as a mere boy, if he has any strategic power, who can draw his armies from the whole of Europe, can rout and drive in confusion the stoutest veterans and greatest hosts that only a small part of Europe, such as Spain, can furnish. That roughly represents the position of a powerful agnostic ; his philosophy gives him a great generalisation, a commanding position,

and artillery of great calibre and massiveness, along with the advantage of moving on interior lines—an advantage military men can appreciate, the first Napoleon won several of his battles by its means—and thus, as long as this continues, a relatively feeble antagonist can logically over-power the greatest men Christendom can send against him. That, I say, is a standing danger which we should strain every nerve to remove; and I see no way of removing it but by constructing a Theistic philosophy. I ask, then, ought this state of things to continue? Can we leave the matter as it is without imperilling the dearest hopes of mankind? Our watchmen scarcely seem in any single instance to perceive the danger. They make light of it in a way which to me often recalls an old proverb about those whom the gods are going to destroy. Our Universities appear to care nothing about the matter. Cambridge in particular has no philosophical chair, although it is hard to see how it can be a *universitas* when it leaves out philosophy, crown and unifier of all the sciences. Certainly all that her sons have done to overthrow this agnostic philosophy may justly be characterised as contemptible. This may arise from the slight estimate she forms of her foe, but knowing what some of her writers have put forth, I incline rather to the opinion that it arises from a philosophical imbecility. Oxford, I fear, is not a great deal better. No deliverance as yet has come from either. Under these circumstances our only hope of success lies in appealing to the solid common sense of intelligent and large-minded Churchmen. I ask, then, is it right or wise to let matters drift on as they have drifted on during the last twenty years? When we find such a brilliant, and, in a sense, powerful, intellect as that of the late Professor Clifford is caught in this agnostic stream, and carried by it far away from God into the region of the everlasting, shall we dare to expose other youths—our strongest and most daring—to the like danger? If we do, the blood of souls will lie at our door, and of all rulers of our Church, the Lord, our chief Bishop and Pastor, will demand it. As a preparation for this speech I put myself in communication with some forty of the leading scientific professors present at the last meeting of the British Association. I wished definite statistics as to the proportion of men of science who hold evolution, and as I expected, scientific men are all but unanimous in its favour. Some of my correspondents express their sense of the need of something being done, and one in particular complains bitterly of the neglect by our Church of this great question. I will read you an extract from his letter. He says, "Nothing could well be worse than the present condition of things. The multitude of half-earnest thinkers falling away from all theistic belief, and those who find it no less than knowledge, the breath of life, deprived of all spiritual aid. There is not a church in this town" (it has considerably over 100,000 inhabitants, with dozens of clergymen of high character and power), "which I, although holding a Theism strongly charged with Christianity, can with any profit attend. If I want to preserve my religion, and especially charity towards my neighbours, I must religiously abstain from going to church." Now this gentleman represents, I have some reason to know, hundreds, perhaps thousands, of similar instances in every large town. They are found all over the land. It is, therefore, I say, a certainty that under present circumstances some of our finest students of science will be carried away from the Theistic belief, and I ask "Is it wise or safe to allow of this." The intellectual greatness of the agnostic philosophy will fascinate them—and until we give them a greater Theistic philosophy, we might as well tell them to prefer Tupper to Shakespeare, as tell them to read our Theistic philosophies, and leave the agnostic alone. Their sense of intellectual self-preservation will forbid this. With the high spirit of youth they will laugh at our cautions. They are caught on the horns of this dilemma—"Which is best—to sacrifice mental greatness, to live in a small mental habitation, and retain unscathed the old Theistic belief,—or to choose mental greatness, to live in a mental palace, where wonders of delight start up at every step, to get with it abundance of motive for a high moral life, and to surrender nothing save spirituality of character?" Shall we dare thus to allow mental greatness to be set in antagonism to a refinement of character that only the spiritual eye can perceive? But that is the choice at present put before our keenest youths. We can offer them no unification of the universe save that fashioned on agnostic lines. We can bring before them no areas of thought, no work of uninspired man, so great as that presents. And this must continue until we do our duty—meet the great need of the age, by fashioning a theistic philosophy which once again, and this time more completely than ever before, shall justify the ways of God to men.

The Right Rev. the PRESIDENT.

I SHOULD like to mention to the Congress before we close, a fact of which I have been reminded, that the General Convention of the American Church is beginning its Triennial Conference in Philadelphia to-morrow. We shall remember that in the best possible way as we open our session to-morrow; and the members of the Congress will not forget that one of our English Bishops will be present at the opening of the Convention. We ought therefore, I think, to let it be publicly known that we make mention of them in our prayers.

TOWN HALL.

TUESDAY AFTERNOON, OCTOBER 2ND.

The Right Rev. the LORD BISHOP OF LICHFIELD in the Chair.

METHODS OF SECURING THE EXPRESSION OF THE OPINION OF THE LAITY.

IN (1) THE PARISH.
(2) THE DIOCESE.
(3) THE CHURCH.

PAPER.

STANLEY LEIGHTON, Esq., M.P., for North Shropshire.

THERE ought to be no antagonism between the churchmanship of the layman and of the clergyman. I do not think there really is any. The one is the complement, as it were, of the other. Differences, unless based in principle, should not be emphasised. Those who set themselves to discuss a question, having first excluded the experts, will probably make themselves ridiculous. It is unprofitable to determine questions of law without the lawyers, of medicine without the doctors, of war without the soldiers, of churchmanship without the clergy. The public, when they take their share in the administration of the things committed to the superintendence of a special profession, must be careful to obtain the co-operation of the profession. Let me not be misunderstood. It is essential, in my view, that the voice of the laity should not be declared alone; but the same condition does not apply to the clergy. The professional judgment on subjects which require special knowledge must always be confided to those in whom the special knowledge resides. Otherwise the opinion is without authority. But to-day we are about to consider the best methods of gauging the general mind of the whole congregation of faithful people who are members of the Church of England. The whole must include all the parts.

I will not magnify the subject. This is the very drudgery of the

Church's work ; to many minds it is distasteful, to some actually distressing. It is work which seems to call forth the less noble side of human nature. There is in it nothing spiritual, there is nothing original. It demands only the somewhat rare quality of practical sagacity, the art of applying the proper means to attain the required end—the end is to keep in efficiency the vast machinery of the Church of England, but the business touches not questions of faith, or morals, or conscience, which must be left in far other hands. It is as members of the Church of England that laymen undertake active co-operation, not as assessors called upon to decide what that Church is or should be. Their activity is best employed on matters which are accidents not essentials of her existence ; such questions as the relations of the Church to the Government, and to those of other communions, or the conditions upon which religious endowments ought to be held, or the order and registration of christenings and weddings, or the right to a special form of burial in a hallowed acre, or the duties of churchmen in regard to the education of the young—these and kindred questions are those to which I limit the sphere of a layman's co-operation.

Let us now review the situation. The victory of the Church of England over Roman Catholicism and Protestant Nonconformity was so complete at the beginning of the last century that the Church herself seems to have fallen asleep—a Parliament exclusively composed of laymen, most of them professing to be churchmen, at such a time might have seemed a not inconvenient assembly for the management of the temporal affairs of the Church. The plan was tried under circumstances which promised success, if not with the acquiescence, at all events without effectual opposition from the Church. Observe the result. Parliament very soon found reason to suspend the sittings of Convocation, so that the expression of professional opinion on Church questions in any corporate form was extinguished for more than a century. If such a state of things were tolerable then, it has ceased to be tolerable now. Parliament has ceased to be a body of professing churchmen. Therefore Parliament has ceased to be any longer capable of expressing the true opinion of the laity of the Church. Obvious as such a conclusion seems to be, churchmen have not yet reconsidered their position. The old system remains unreformed. Now this backwardness in taking the initiative is not the result of want of activity among churchmen ; it is a result of want of leadership. I have said that the agency of Parliament as a means of expressing the lay opinion of churchmen is no longer possible. But I say also that neither can the Church of England, nor any other religious or civil denomination in the land, stand independent of Parliament. Therefore ordinary prudence should induce churchmen to provide some effective method of making known their desires, which Parliament cannot mistake or afford to neglect. A cry of passionate weakness, almost of despair, still echoes in our ears, which bids us withdraw Church questions from the cognisance of Parliament. As well might the citizens of a beleaguered city disarm when the enemy is preparing for the assault ! As well might a man of peace ignore the courts of law when the next day he may be haled to the bar ! Such conduct may have the appearance of magnanimity, but it is not business. To-day we are not called upon to act the martyr's or the hero's part. We are called upon to do the drudgery of vulgar work.

The counsels which would lead us to neglect the common ways and means are counsels of blindness or of indolence, or that of base hope which whispers—"Your vested interests are safe, a barren protest will save your honour, and will save you trouble."

If I am right in my conclusion that the popular voice of the Church must be expressed by the union of the voices of clergy and the laity, then it follows that neither can the Convocations nor the House of Commons utter the particular voice we wish to hear. Let us then take into consideration the organisations which have grown up amongst us in the present day, and seem to be the natural outcome of the conditions of our own particular circumstances—the parochial council, the diocesan conference, the central council of diocesan conferences. Mark well that all of these are voluntary associations. They do not encroach upon any of the constitutional assemblies of the Church or of the commonwealth. They are mixed—partly lay, partly clerical. They ascend from the unit of the parish to the union of the dioceses. They cover the whole ground. They are self-planted. In a democracy wisdom is tested by numerical majorities. We must not be offended at the conditions of success which the society of our time demands. Let us always remember that we do not want to create a new governing body for the Church. That is a reason, if I may say so in passing, why a new mixed House of Convocation, or a supplemental lay House of Convocation is not what we want. What we are in need of is a method of proving in a popular way, so as to be understood by the people, the right of the Church of England to freedom in carrying on her work in her own appointed ways, without hindrance from the Legislature. Her right indeed to obtain from the Legislature, what every corporation in the land may obtain, that is to say, amendments of the law whenever required by the growing wants of her congregations or by the altered circumstances of the times. To accomplish this end we must be able to speak distinctly enough to catch the ear of a Parliament which is ever ready to listen to the word of the strong. Business is done to-day not by the command of a single authority, however eminent, but by the babbling of a million tongues significant of public approval.

The organisations which I have mentioned do not, I think, sufficiently recognise the necessity of influencing those outside. They are not bold enough. They are not aggressive enough. They do not work enough together. The diocesan conference is not yet sufficiently linked with the parochial council. The parochial council does not yet feel itself sufficiently part and parcel by means of representation of the diocesan conference. To organise the spirit of the people, to utilise and ecomise the zeal of the congregations is one of the objects of lay co-operation. This cannot be accomplised by "Act of Parliament" parochial councils; it can be done, it has been done already in many a parish, by the voluntary parochial council, which is no longer an idea but a fact. Work and consultation must go hand in hand. Every new development runs the gauntlet of criticism. The diocesan conference and the Church Congress are the firstfruits of a modern experiment. They offer opportunity for speech and consultation, but they are in need of a more regular and definite system of work. We may devise with elaborate carefulness arrangements for perfect representation; we may call representatives;

but will they come? They will certainly not continue to come, unless they are asked to help in doing as well as talking and listening. It has been said by one who knows, that the Church of England would have her own way in the things which appertain to the Church, if it were known of a certainty what that way was. Any caviller can now easily produce names of weight on either side, and the mind of the public is easily confused. These differences are not only natural, but they are a wholesome sign of health. Similar differences are to be found in every company of men. We do not desire to level our differences. But we need a method of deciding upon which side rests the weight of the majority.

The special duty which in this matter seems to be cast upon us in this generation is to organise popular opinion—a duty which has never presented itself before with such imperious necessity. The test of the strength of the Church in a diocese will be proved by the influence which the diocesan conference is able to exercise. The conferences must realise the scope of their responsibilities. They must be conferences for business as well as for talk. Putting aside every vestige of political partisanship, churchmen citizens must, through their voluntary assemblies, make sure that their representatives in Parliament are not left in any doubt as to their resolutions and their determination to act upon them, if need be, to the utmost of their ability, so that when the business of the Church is brought before Parliament, as the business of every Church in the land must be from time to time, the votes of their representatives shall be given, not in the interests of one political party or the other, far less in the interests of one particular section of the religious community, but in the interests of religion. I know that this insistence is very disagreeable. Why not leave everything to the consciences of members of Parliament? Others shall answer that question. I maintain this only, that whenever and wherever Church questions are raised, there churchmen should take care, as far as in them lies, that their true opinions shall find adequate expression. A diocesan Parliamentary committee to look after such business ought to be an essential department of every diocesan conference. A report of such a committee ought to be an essential part of the annual business. The work must be carried on continuously. Triennial conferences are of very little use. I have here indicated a branch of practical work not altogether uncongenial to the English temper, and well suited for lay co-operation. If undertaken with tact and earnestness it would instil vigour into the proceedings of the conferences, for it would make churchmen feel that they had a common rallying point, and it would make the opponents of the Church understand that the laity, as well as the clergy, were a power which must be reckoned with.

What shall I say of the last attempt to consolidate the organisation of the voluntary movement; the creation of a Central Council of Diocesan Conferences? It is founded in the need of gathering together in popular form all the utterances of all the conferences. The weapon it wields is public opinion. The power it does not shrink from facing is the Government of the country. Not as an *imperium in imperio* does it assert itself, but by the force of persuasion, by the legitimate exercise through constitutional means of influence. It presents a formulated answer, in the verdict of the dioceses to the taunt that

churchmen know not their own minds. It claims no authority over its constituent dioceses. They each of them follow the bent of their own inclinations. But all its strength is derived from them, and in them are centred all its hopes and all its fears.

ADDRESSES.

The Rev. J. F. PONSONBY, Vicar of St. Mary Magdalene, Munster Square, N.W.

IN speaking of the best methods of securing the lay opinion in the parish, of course we mean opinions upon questions distinctly affecting the Church, and I think it is very important that such opinion should be *instructed* and thoroughly *independent*, that it should not be a little clerical coterie in which the lay element echoes the vicar, and that it should not be the opinion of two or three aggrieved parishioners acted upon by some external society. And then, lay opinion must be *helpful*, and not merely fault finding. A critic has been defined as an artist who has failed, and there is some truth in the definition; present help, not distant criticism, is what is wanted, what will advance the good of the church and parish. A difficulty arises in country parishes where there are no educated helpers, perhaps not even squire, or medical man, or farmer to help, and people naturally say—Where are you to get your parochial council from? It is the lot of many of the clergy to work in such parishes, where they are surrounded by people who indifferently get into the habit of leaving everything to the parson to do. You know the difficulties I allude to, such as trying to start a new service to suit the convenience of the people, and when you ask what they think of it, the invariable answer is, "Oh, it is as you please." It, however, is still a matter which has not yet been sufficiently tried, for services intended for Hodge's benefit should have Hodge's help in it. I shall not on this occasion deal with the country aspect of the question. For the last five years I have been working a London parish, but nearly 20 years ago, when I was curate of St. Giles', Reading, this question of parochial councils was raised after a mission in the town, and one of the leading townsmen, Mr. J. Henry Wilson, wrote a pamphlet on the subject. In my London parish, we have a Church Council, and it consists of the vicar, the churchwardens, and 18 communicants. We considered the question as to whom we should elect, and we finally arranged that a roll of communicants should be put in the vestry at the beginning of Lent until after Easter, and all who chose to put their names down were entitled to vote. You will see, therefore, that our council is composed of communicants elected by the communicants. There, no doubt, is a good deal to be said on the point whether such a council should be elected by the communicants only, but it is important that people should know the fact that, unless they are communicants they are not full members of the Church of England, and that they are not claiming the full privileges of their position as members of the Church. It is important for the purposes of this council that they should be really and truly full members of the Church. There is another reason why we adopted the plan of having a roll of communicants. In London, the districts and parishes do not coincide with the area from which a congregation is gathered. People choose their own churches in London, they go and come as they like, and often change their residences, so that to have the limits of a parish as the qualification is not to secure the true body of the congregation. We meet when it is necessary,

and I would caution my brother clergy to be careful that they do not bring laymen together for nothing ; they need to have a clear agenda put before them, and distinct business to consider. Our Church Council is divided into various committees, one dealing with the offertories—and a great help that is to the clergy—another with the funds for the assistant clergy, and others for the fabric, for the schools, and other things of that sort. I know the objection that may be urged to this—that it is a council called by the vicar, and that it will die with him, but it is felt that the clergy must be the motive power in this matter, and I for one dread the interference of a State appointed parochial council which would represent the whole of the ratepayers, and not the Church feeling of the parish. We have every means of fraternising with our Nonconformist brethren on many a neutral platform, but it is contrary, I think, to justice and fairness that they should have a control over our services any more than that we should have a control over their chapels. I only recommend this parochial council for what it is worth, but I can assure my brother clergy that for five years it has to me been a source of the very greatest help. Of course there are differences of opinion sometimes, but on important points we are unanimous. Practically, the council is elected by communicants, and consequently has the welfare of the Church at heart. I know that in these days tests are not regarded with much favour, but we must have some test of Churchmanship. People sometimes in their insane objection to all tests seem to think that the best qualification there is for them to decide on anything is that they have not made up their minds about it. I advise all who have a parochial council to take care that it is composed of selected, true, and loyal earnest churchmen.

The Right Hon. Sir John Mowbray, Bart., M.P. for the University of Oxford.

Before I proceed with the second branch of our subject—the Methods of Securing the Expressions of the Opinion of the Laity *in the Diocese*, I wish to make two remarks on the paper and speech we have just heard. I agree almost entirely with what Mr. S. Leighton has said, and with much that has fallen from Mr. Ponsonby, and I think that parochial councils should not be created by Act of Parliament. As a layman I would rather that such councils should be elected by the parishioners, and not nominated by the vicar—that they should be rather parochial than congregagational, and representative of a parish as a whole, and not of any section. I think my hon. friend has fully shown that.

For many years past it has been felt that there is a great want of some systematic organisation in the Church of England, by which the laity may be enabled to give expression to their opinions, and hence in many cases there has been misunderstandings between clergy and laity. This did not attract so much attention in the last century and the early part of the present, when Convocation was silent. The clergy were represented by the bishops in the House of Lords. The lay members of the Church found their representatives, more or less accredited, among temporal peers and members of the House of Commons. But now, with the awakened life of the Church and the restored action of Convocation, the laity feel that they too have as great an interest in the Church as the clergy ; they desire to co-operate in Church work, to express their views in debate, and to record their opinion if necessary ; and they feel that they have a right to be consulted on matters which vitally affect them. If doubt be entertained in any quarter as to the right of the laity, I would fortify

myself with the language of so great an authority as Hooker, who says—"Till it be proved that some special law of Christ hath for ever annexed unto the clergy alone the power to make ecclesiastical laws, we are to hold it a thing most consonant with equity and reason that no ecclesiastical laws be made in a Christian commonwealth without the consent as well of the laity as of the clergy." I say, then, the laity claim a right, believe it to be a duty, feel it to be a privilege, to take part in the work of the Church. And how are they to do so in that branch of the subject to which I am restricted—viz., the diocese? We have now organisations at work which are voluntary in their origin, and representative in their character. Diocesan conferences, no longer a doubtful experiment, but tried for many years past, seem to supply the want, and I believe supply it well. I can testify somewhat from my own knowledge in the diocese of Oxford. It is ten years since the bishop summoned his first diocesan conference. He was slow to make the experiment. His eminent predecessor had not initiated such a step; he had very little, if any, guidance from ancient precedents, either as regarded mixed gatherings of clergy and laity, or the application of the principle of representation. But the bishop took counsel with the synod of his clergy, and called the first conference in October, 1873. Since that they have met regularly every year. As to the composition, independently of official members, the elected representatives were in the proportion of two clergy to three laity, or 200 clergymen to 300 laymen; but as the clergy attended better than the laymen, the numbers actually present were nearly equal. All orders and degrees of men have been there—a lord-lieutenant of a county and high sheriffs; a Cabinet minister and a judge; peers and members of Parliament; large landowners, tenant farmers, and yeomen; professional men and shopkeepers; heads of colleges, and University professors. We have discussed in the course of ten years the Bills from time to time before Parliament affecting the Church, and most of the leading Church topics of the day—we have not shrunk from burning questions. There has been no lack of freedom of speech, but no acrimony in debate; no want of charity or courtesy in our deliberations. We have arrived at conclusions and have avoided them by the previous question. We have had frequent divisions, sometimes when the numbers were evenly balanced, at other times when the minority was small. Once there was an even division, and the bishop would not give the casting vote. Provision was made in the constitution for a division by orders, but, in fact, none has been actually taken, although one was once called informally and too late. The numbers attending have not fallen off, the interest does not flag, the success is beyond doubt, and attributable in no small degree to our good fortune in being presided over by so able a chairman as our reverend diocesan. Objection may be taken that there are no special or tangible results. This may be granted. But ten years is no long time in the history of a nation or a diocese. Opinions have been expressed, conclusions in some measures arrived at; foundations laid for future action. Representatives have been sent to the Central Council. I will not say that these conferences are necessary in every diocese, but I see that this year the great diocese of London has come in, and has held its diocesan conference. They are now nearly universal. Possibly in smaller areas, where the population is more concentrated, it may be comparatively easy to ascertain the sentiments of the laity. But in Oxford, where three counties have been lately welded into one diocese, and elsewhere, as in the old dioceses of Durham, Lincoln, and Exeter, each of which comprised two large counties, it is simply impossible to obtain the desired result, except by bringing delegates from a distance to one central spot. No substitute is satisfactory; no annual or quarterly meeting of diocesan societies; no contrivances for pleasant social gatherings in cathedral cities will produce the same result, as a conference formally summoned by the bishop, presided over by him, opened with

prayer, conducted with all solemnity, and having a distinctive character of its own. In such assemblies the life of the National Church is quickened. The active energies of the laity are called forth, as well as the zeal of the clergy. Men learn to know and respect one another's opinions—perhaps sometimes to modify them. Anyhow they carry away a lesson of charity. It is perhaps not too much to say, that had such conferences been universal in 1874, no such disastrous measure as the Public Worship Regulation Act would have been passed in such hot haste through Parliament. In the absence of them, demands will arise for the admission of the laity to Convocation, an innovation which will not be reform, but revolution. It is of course contended by some that the opinions of the laity will be found in the House of Commons; but that can no longer be maintained as regards that heterogeneous assembly, and so far as I can see, there is no satisfactory substitute for the diocesan conference.

Sir George K. Rickards, K.C.B.

In entering upon the question which it has devolved upon me to introduce to this meeting, I wish to say distinctly at the outset that I intend carefully to abstain from topics of theology. It is easy to see how theological controversies of an exciting nature might be evolved out of the question before us, but if our discussion should unluckily take that turn, it will not be in accordance with my intention, nor, I undertake to say, in pursuance of my example. It is not with the Church as a Divine institution, commissioned to maintain and propagate a body of revealed truths, that I am now concerned—it is with the Church Establishment as by law subsisting, regarded as the instrument recognised and favoured by the civil power, for conducting the religious worship and the spiritual instruction of the nation. I desire that the voice of the laity should be allowed a more free utterance than is now conceded to it, not on points of theology, not on matters of creed and doctrine, but upon the conditions and arrangements under which the functions just specified are performed, and the means available for making them more efficient and more widely communicated.

The question is frequently asked, at the present time, how long will the Church of England continue to be an Established Church? To which, I believe, the true answer is simply this—so long as she continues to be, in a real sense, the Church of the nation, and no longer. The sister Church of Ireland was severed from the State because it was proved by full experience that she had never been, nor did she give any promise of becoming in the future, the Church of the Irish nation. The same with the Episcopal Church of Scotland, which it was found impossible to maintain as an Established Church in the teeth of a nation resolutely attached to the Presbyterian model. If, then, it has been found impossible in the past to maintain a legally established religion which was not that of the bulk of the nation, much less, we may be assured, will it be possible, in view of the tendency of opinion in our own time, to maintain such a Church in the future. If the Church of England, I repeat, should cease to be the Church of the bulk of the nation, she will retain her privileges as the Church of the State no longer.

The Church of England is now by profession *national*. Her name imports it—her legal position and her constitutional practice assume it. Though, unhappily, a large section of the community is estranged from her communion, she repudiates none. Her doors are open, her fold is free to all. Every subject of the realm is in contemplation of law a member of her flock. To every seceder she allows a *locus pœnitentiæ*. There is consequently at all times a large floating residuum on her confines,

who waver to and fro, and at one time or another, as circumstances may incline them, attend her worship and partake of her ordinances, or go elsewhere—or nowhere. An accurate census of her members would be difficult at any time to make. Numerically considered, the Church may possibly not much exceed the aggregate of all the religious bodies put together, but doubtless she much outnumbers any other single communion. Yet of a large part of her own adherents it must be sorrowfully confessed that their allegiance is little more than nominal.

Now my position is this, that if the union of Church and State is to be maintained, the Church must become in a much more true and thorough sense than she now is, the Church, not of the whole, for that is impossible in a country where opinion is free as it is with us, but of the great bulk of the nation—the Church, not of the State and the aristocracy, "exalting," as Burke has said, "her mitred head in Courts and Parliaments"—not of the educated, the well-to-do, the *respectable* part of the community, but the Church of the poor, and especially of the working class; not only of the rustic labourers in these Arcadian villages of the diocese of Oxford, living under the shadow of their parish church, and the hereditary influence of the squirearchy, but of the workmen in mills, mines, and factories, of the crowded centres and swarming towns of the north also; in a word, the Church whose creed, ordinances, and worship fulfil the needs and satisfy the consciences of the great bulk of the diversified population of this country.

But if this result is to be brought about, much has to be done. Great exertions have to be made. Large resources to be supplied. Not only will it be necessary to enlarge the working power of the Church by increasing the fabrics, the services, and all the various agencies of her system, but it will be necessary to widen the doors also, to remove some obstructions, and to offer some concessions to those who are without. In speaking of such changes, I am conscious that I am treading on delicate ground. There are many, I am well aware, probably some among those I now address, who would recoil from any proposition of compromise or concession, who cling with the utmost tenacity to every tittle of the Church's tests and formularies, and would not consent to expunge or modify even one Article of the prescriptive 39, even if by doing so they would bring back tens of thousands of the community to the pale of the Church. I do not presume to condemn such persons, who are, no doubt, as sincere and honest in their opinions as I claim myself to be; at the same time, I cannot withhold my conviction that if this rigorous adherence to a stereotyped system is to be maintained—the severance of the connection between Church and State looms, not in a distant, but a comparatively early, future—the Church of England cannot become the Church of the nation, and upon no other condition can the existing union be maintained.

All experience of mankind since Christianity began has proved that it is impossible, from the diversity of moulds in which human minds are cast, that all should think alike upon the more abstruse and mysterious doctrines of religion; but the practical question now before us who desire to reclaim to the communion of the Church thousands, or I might rather say millions, of the people who are now estranged from her is, What amount of unanimity it is necessary to exact as a basis of Church membership; what relaxation may be allowed of the terms of conformity, in respect to that large mass of persons, chiefly of the humbler and less educated class, whom we desire to see partaking with us of the ordinances, and joining in the common worship of the Church? I venture to express my humble opinion that, if the object of a National Church be to promote the spiritual good of the largest possible number of the community, then it should be our study to remove, so far as a regard for divine truth will allow, whatever bars the admission of large numbers of

the people to her fold ; that we ought not to stickle too much for matters of form, or ritual or ecclesiastical precedent. We should find, I believe, on a careful scrutiny, some things in the tests and formularies of the Church which may be pruned and simplified, and made easier to the common understanding—matters which I will not further descant upon, particularly as it is one of the subjects to be discussed at another meeting of this Congress, "By what means the Services of the Church can be best adapted to Modern Needs."

If then such changes as I have indicated are to be made, not in the doctrines, but in the operative machinery and practical action of the Church, the next question is, in whom should be vested the discretion of initiating and formulating the measures to be adopted? Is there any existing body suitable for the task? Would a Royal Commission be the proper body for the purpose, or should the duty be assigned to Parliament or the Convocation? Not a Commission, because what is required is a permanent institution, not a temporary makeshift ; but still more because a Royal Commission is not a representative, but a nominated body. Not Parliament, because although that body must, I presume, be required to give the ultimate sanction to all changes in the legal status of the Church, yet the House of Commons, besides the fact that it is already overloaded with business, is from its constitution peculiarly ill-qualified for the discussion of ecclesiastical or theological details. Lastly, not the Convocation, because as now constituted, it does not profess to represent the great body of the Church, who are the laity, nor does it even represent the clergy, but only a limited portion of that body, and if it should be asked, Might not the Convocation be remodelled in these respects? my answer is that if remodelled upon the lines which I propose, it would involve so fundamental a change in its structure and constitution, that it would no longer be Convocation, but a new body, and as it is a new body that I propose to create, I do not think there would be an advantage, but the reverse, in retaining merely the shell and crust of the ancient institution.

The body, then, which I would propose to constitute *de novo*, is one which should be in the truest and fullest sense representative of the Church at large, of all its sections, all its schools of thought and diversities of opinion. In such a Council the lay members of the Church would naturally claim to form an important constituent. Is there any one who will seriously dispute that claim? Why, the laity, not the clergy, are the Church—the latter consisting of a few thousands, the laity numbered by millions. The clergy are the officers, the laity are the army. And as the officers exist for the sake of the army, not the army for the sake of the officers, so, without disrespect, I would say that the clergy exist for the laity, not the laity for the clergy. What says Hooker on this subject? "Till it be proved that some special law of Christ hath for ever annexed unto the clergy alone the power to make ecclesiastical laws, we are to hold it as a thing most consonant to equity and reason, that no ecclesiastical laws be made in a Christian commonwealth without consent as well of the laity as of the clergy, but least of all without the consent of the highest power."—Book viii. cap. 6. It would seem as if our perceptions of the rights of the laity, in this respect, had undergone much relapse since Hooker wrote this and other similar passages. What is to be desired, then, in the proposed church council, is that it should contain a proper admixture of the wisdom and experience of the laity, who should be, of course, exclusively churchmen, and the most able and influential of the clergy. There is, as all who have had experience in such matters must acknowledge, a difference between the clerical and the lay mind. I have not time now to analyse the causes of this difference, but it certainly exists ; and I think men who know the world, whether lay or clerical, would generally agree that in practical matters, in the transaction of business, the clerical mind does require to

be balanced and supplemented by the lay element. But, again, the non-clerical members of the Council should represent the laity of the Church in its largest range and its widest diversities. There is a section of the laity always to be met with at Church Congresses and Conferences, some of whom, doubtless, are present on this occasion. As individuals, I would speak of them with all respect. Excellent men they are—none better. It is not necessary to name such; we are familiar with their aspects, their sentiments, and their good deeds. But they are all of one uniform type—all answer the same designation, that of the "clerical-minded layman." These, of course, should have their place in due proportion, but they should be balanced by laymen of other views and characters, men of various professions and pursuits—the leading minds, if they can be procured, of their several districts, men who know the wants, and the feelings, and the religious condition of the various classes of the population, such as the large employers of manufacturing labour, some of whom have themselves belonged to the labour class. The House of Commons contains such a diversity of elements as I have described—but then they are not, as in the proposed council they would be, all churchmen. I will not now enter upon the question of the mode of electing the lay or clerical members. I do not attempt, nor would the time allow me, to set forth a detailed and finished scheme. Enough to say now, that I believe a body, really representative of the Church, might be constituted which would answer the general description that I have given. I would only add now that I do not contemplate that its power of enacting measures should be final. I think upon constitutional principles that its Acts should receive the stamp of the Supreme Legislature. The body would, in many respects, be like one of those Grand Committees of which a successful experiment has been made in the last session. It would shape and frame the measures to which Parliament would be asked to affix its *imprimatur*.

Lastly, as to the subject matter of the Council's jurisdiction—not, as I said before, theological questions, but all matters pertaining to the temporalities of the Church, the application of her resources, the regulation of cathedral and other establishments, the arrangement of Church Services and their adaptation to the needs of the community, the procuring of fresh resources for enabling the Church to meet the increased demands upon its funds, and to extend the sphere of its operations.

Time will not allow me to say more. There is much that I should have wished to add—to simplify and to explain, to anticipate and meet objections, but I must forbear. I end as I began, by saying that if it is highly desirable, as I believe it is, to maintain the connection between Church and State—for the sake of the State, which, if the bond were broken, would in some respects be unchristianised; for the sake of the Church which, if the tie which now holds it in unity were snapped, would, I believe, suffer a disruption into fragments, engendering a new crop of sects and schisms—we should do our utmost to adopt such measures as may make the Church, to which we belong, not merely a State Establishment, but a national religious communion.

DISCUSSION.

The Rev. EDWARD MILLER, Rector of Bucknell, Oxon.

THE remark which has been made relative to the large number of clergymen who have given in their cards to speak, shows, I submit, the great interest felt by the clergy in the question of getting a satisfactory representation of the laity in the authorised councils of the Church. Indeed, I look upon this question as the most

important ecclesiastical question of the day. But I cannot agree in the opinion expressed by Mr. Stanley Leighton, that a satisfactory solution could not be found in a lay body acting with the Convocations. And if you will allow me, I will explain the strong grounds which forbid such an agreement. The last occasion on which we find the laymen of the Church of England acting with the clergy was the Revision of the Prayer Book in 1662. The English Parliament sanctioned what the Convocations had done. But what do we find in 1707, the year of the Union of Scotland, but that an almost silent revolution took place? At the Review of 1662, the laity in the English Parliament acted with the clergy in accepting the Prayer Book, but after 1707 Parliament was no longer the lay representative body of the Church of England, because it included the Scotch members, who, insomuch as they represent those who live across the Tweed, cannot be taken to be officially laymen of the Church of England. The members for Edinburgh, Glasgow, or Ayrshire, for example, cannot be held to represent the Church on this side of the Cheviots. The confusion has been still more increased by the union with Ireland, and by the introduction into the Imperial Parliament of Nonconformists, Roman Catholics, and others who do not belong to the Church of England. So that *organically*, because Scotland and Ireland, which cannot for a moment be considered to be within the area of the English Church, and, *severally*, because of so many members who are not Churchmen, the Imperial Parliament does not now represent the laymen of the Church of England. At the present time, therefore, we have no proper expression of the lay mind, and the right way to deal with the matter would be to get a body of laymen who would act with the Convocations—not to do anything within the Convocations, but to give their sanction to what an united Convocation did ; and also to join the clergy in discussing the general questions relating to the Church. With regard to the Central Council, it has no doubt acted very usefully as a temporary expedient, and it has worked well, but it cannot be considered satisfactory as a permanent institution. It is dangerous, because it may in time, if it goes on, become the *managing* body of the Church. It is now well administered, but if it continues, we have no guarantee that the management of it will always continue to be wise and good. If, however, we had a body of laymen acting with the Convocations, but with well defined and limited powers, I cannot help thinking that we then should have a satisfactory mode of lay representation for the Church of England. Then the question arises, How is this to be done, and who is to set it on foot? Is it to be done by the State—is it to be set on foot by Parliament? I say, certainly not. The proper attitude for the Church to assume, is to develop its powers by its voluntary movements, and so go step by step on to the great future that lies before her. The question should be carefully examined into by the diocesan conferences, and gradually as the matter is settled and adopted by the Convocations, we can then go to Parliament for its sanction of our scheme. But Parliament cannot settle this matter for us, because Parliament is essentially unfitted to deal with Church questions. Take the Prime Minister, for instance. I have a great admiration for his character as a Churchman, though I differ from him politically. But such is the confusion into which things have drifted, that, although he as Prime Minister has more to do with the Church than almost any other man, nevertheless, so far as his *official* position as member for Midlothian is concerned, he is not a member of the Church of England. A little consideration will show you this. So far as he is member for Midlothian, he derives his position from his constituents whom he represents ; and they cannot by any possibility as inhabitants of Midlothian be held to be laymen in the Church on this side of the border. I speak of Mr. Gladstone's official character alone as a Scotch member, not of his personal character as an English Churchman, or even as Prime Minister. I speak also from a Church point of view. I was quite aware that what I should say would cause surprise at first, but, if you will think it all out, you will see that it is as I say. This general question is of a most important nature, because the great difficulty of the Church is that the laity have no proper, definite, and clear expression of opinion in her councils. And her duty in the future is to work out such an expression as shall be grounded upon her history, shall not touch upon the peculiar province and the special responsibilities of the clergy, and shall form such a permanent institution as in my opinion the Central Council of Diocesan Conferences, however it may meet temporary needs, can, notwithstanding, never be.

The Right Hon. Earl Beauchamp.

I came into the room this afternoon intending to preserve an unbroken silence, but it seems to me that the remarks of Sir George Rickards require some notice, which will perhaps come best from a layman. In his speech Sir George Rickards laid down some very dangerous principles, and it is to protest against them that I now address the Congress. He commenced by sweeping away Convocation, and went on to say that the Church of England would be the Church of the people only so long as she satisfied the consciences of toiling millions of the people. Now I do not understand that it is the mission of the Church to satisfy the consciences of a people. I do not understand that our Lord set up His kingdom on earth to satisfy the consciences either of the Roman Empire or of the Jewish people. Surely when we are all deploring the spread of unbelief, and when we desire to bring the masses of the people into the Church, this is not the time to relax our tests and formularies and endeavour to please the popular conscience. It is true that such a sentiment is not a new one, and I remember that when the phrase was used some years ago, it was answered by pointing out that Pontius Pilate was anxious to satisfy the people when he handed over our Lord to be crucified. It is no doubt most useful to ascertain what may be the opinion of the laity in the parish and in the diocese, but we must banish from our minds the notion that it is the mission of the Church to satisfy the conscience of the people. Until we, at least, bring the people under the influence of the Church, we must always remember that the Church's business is to be a great teaching body. The Church has to teach, and not to learn. I have made my protest, and I now turn to the question before us. As regards Diocesan Conferences and the Central Council, I think that the danger alluded to by the last speaker need not alarm us very much. These bodies are consultative and voluntary, and the function of the Central Council is simply to give advice. With respect to parochial councils and their constitution, we must bear in mind that what is good for one parish may be very bad for another, and therefore we must not seek after a hard and fast rule, to be applied to every parish alike. Councils of this sort should be purely voluntary and consultative, and if wisely and prudently managed promote that unity and that realisation of our duty to one another as Christians, so touchingly described this morning by the Archbishop of Canterbury, in his sermon at St. Mary's.

The Rev. A. J. Foster, Vicar of Wootton, Bedfordshire.

I wish to deal with the first part of the subject. It is generally supposed that it is very easy to get the opinions of the laity in a parish in the country, and that the clergyman has only to go round his parish to hear what those opinions are. That is not my experience, and I believe that it is very difficult to get at the real opinions of the laity in country parishes, from the squire downwards. I would ask first, Is it needful to try and get the opinions of parishioners in the country? and, secondly, What are the existing means for so doing? First, is there a need? Now, village people have, I am sorry to say, a nasty habit of grumbling at the parson behind his back, instead of coming to him and telling him their grievances. There is little doubt that in the place where all village business is talked over—the village public-house—the sayings and doings of the parson are discussed freely, but it is only by sidewinds that the parson himself learns what it is that his critics are saying about him. There is also another reason why it is desirable that the laity should be induced to make known their opinions in a voluntary way. We have looming before us, in the House of Commons, a bill to create compulsory parochial councils for every parish. That, however, hardly comes before us to-day, because we are discussing "the expression of opinion," and not the forcing of any line of action that it pleased upon the incumbent. Now as to the machinery by which this expression of opinion is to be secured. I must, in the first instance, reject the ordinary parish vestry, because it is elected by all the ratepayers of whatever creed. But would it not be possible to have the Easter vestry for churchmen alone? In country parishes the Lady-Day vestry deals with secular matters, and the Easter vestry is for the election of churchwardens. It has always seemed to me a mistake that when Church rates were abolished the Easter vestry was not confined to churchmen. It might be possible to accept that vestry as a means of expressing opinion, if altered in that way. I cannot accept the churchwardens as the representatives of the laity, for the same reasons that I cannot accept

the ordinary vestry. I think a good council might be formed in most parishes out of the Church workers, such as Sunday school teachers, and those who are in the habit of having teachers' meetings will find that when the business of the meeting is over, it is often easy to lead the conversation on to Church matters connected with the parish. Then there is another piece of existing machinery which might be utilised. I mean the election of lay delegates for the ruridecanal or archidiaconal conferences. But we must first make those elections a reality. We might then make those representatives the nucleus of a parochial council; and they would be the real mouthpieces of the people, if elected with that object distinctly in view.

The Rev. THEOPHILUS BENNETT, M.A., Curate in Charge of Chudleigh, Devon.

I STAND up in this Congress as the advocate of parochial councils. The speaker who said that Mr. Gladstone as a Scotch M.P. was not an English churchman, certainly put forward a very strange doctrine indeed. I myself have every confidence in Mr. Gladstone's legislation for the Church. As I represent a parish of which I have sole charge, the vicar being eighty-seven years of age, I should be very glad of a Church board, and I wonder Mr. Albert Grey is not here, as he was last year at Derby. He would be the right man in the right place. We have now had some experience of School Boards, and I myself was the chairman of one in Yorkshire for six years. They have worked very well, and why should not Church boards be equally useful and workable? I was very glad to hear Sir George Rickards taken to task for his strange remarks. I have been a beneficed clergyman in the Irish Church, and I know that the reason which led to that Church being disestablished and disendowed was the pride and *autocracy* of the clergy. We need the council of the laity, and we would do wisely to consult them on little things, recollecting how the Bishop of Oxford told us "not to make ourselves disagreeable in little things." The great Bishop of Peterborough—my eloquent fellow countryman—once said, that if all Christendom was only united but for an hour, what might they not achieve in that hour, and if all churchmen were united but for an hour, what might they not achieve for the Church in that hour. The Bishop of Peterborough lately urged upon the Church the necessity of getting hold of the *masses* of the people, and depend upon it we ought to aim at winning the masses back to the Church of England. We are endeavouring to be practical to-day, and we ought to practice more Christian charity. I once represented a noble lord in a Dorset parish, and because I had a few panes of glass put into the Wesleyan Chapel in the parish a great fuss was made about it. That is not Christian charity, and only the other day we had Bishop Ryle held up to execration by "the grandmotherly *Guardian*," because he performed a Christian *act* of charity in Scotland.

WILLIAM FORSYTH, Esq., Q.C., 61, Rutland Gate, S.W.

MORE than one speaker has attacked what my friend Sir George Rickards has said, and Lord Beauchamp has dissented from some of his statements. I wish to say that I think he has in one particular misunderstood his meaning. I myself agree with the sentiments expressed by Sir George Rickards in his able speech, and think that when well considered it will be found to contain a great deal of good sense and practical wisdom. When he said that the Church of England must be in unison with the consciences of the nation, I do not suppose that he meant that she is to accommodate her doctrines and principles to public opinion; but that it cannot be called a national Church unless it represents generally the religious views of the nation. If the Church represents the views of a mere fractional minority it cannot be a national Church. We may instance the cases of Scotland and of Ireland. I do not, however, agree with Sir George Rickards that it would be necessary or wise to abolish Convocation. That would, I think, be a mistake. We have an institution which has come down to us from remote antiquity, and which has withal the *prestige* of long tradition,

and has been taken as the voice of the Church for centuries. Our object should be to reform it so as to make it more effectual. There is a common fallacy abroad that the Church consists only of the clergy, and when we speak of the Church we are apt to think only of the clergy, and to forget the laity, who form the great mass of the Church. Of course this is wrong, but, as a matter of fact, it is so. Nothing tends more to emphasize the distinction than the fact that the laity are not represented in Convocation, and it would do much to remove the unfortunate opinion that now prevails in the public mind as to the identification of the Church with the clergy, if we had a strong infusion of the lay element in Convocation. In parochial councils and diocesan conferences, the extreme advantage of having lay members has been generally recognised, and if the principle of fusion of clergy with laymen is good for the parish and the diocese, why should it not also be equally good for Convocation? At present the voice of Convocation is thought to be only a clerical voice, and so is regarded with jealousy and suspicion, but if Convocation were reorganised in a more comprehensive manner, and if a body of laymen were added to it, I believe its recommendations and decisions would have much more influence with members of the Church. Its effect too on the House of Commons would be important. At present Parliament regards the voice of Convocation as merely the voice of the clergy, but if it came from a body including lay representatives of the whole Church, I believe that with that spirit of fairness and equity which animates Englishmen, Parliament would give greater consideration to what was recommended by it, and that it would be much more inclined to listen to it with attention and respect.

The Rev. and Hon. AUGUSTUS LEGGE, Vicar of Lewisham.

I PROPOSE to confine myself to the parochial branch of the subject before us. If the laity are to be invited to give expression to their opinion, some power must be given them to carry out that opinion when expressed; and it appears to me that a body of layman called in to advise, must have a legal *status*, legal authority, and legally defined duties. Unless their position is so guarded, we shall not, in my opinion, get them to work for the Church. But, then, what is to be the constituency in the parish? Is it to be made up of all communicants, or all baptized persons, or all ratepayers? The representation of the nation in Parliament is based upon the principle that all who contribute to the revenue should have some control over the expenditure; and we find that something of the same kind existed in the Church up to within the last few years. In the old parishes, the vestries, *i.e.*, the ratepayers, made the Church rate, and had a voice in the spending of the money. They were invested with a control over the current expenses of the services of the Church, over the maintenance of the fabric, and over all alterations in the Church; as none could be legally carried out without a faculty, and a faculty could only be applied for with the consent of the vestry. But now, Church rates having been abolished, there is not the same reason why the ratepayers should have a voice in the affairs of the Church, since they as ratepayers do not contribute to its support. In our parochial councils we ought to carry out the old constitutional principle, and those should be the constituency who are contributors to the funds of the Church. In my own parish we have formed a parochial board, and we have based our constituency on this principle. The congregation, who contribute, or are supposed to contribute, by means of the offertory, to our parochial institutions, and all contributors in other ways, form the constituency. In this way only those are represented who are connected with and interested in the Church. But this is not the ideal of a legally constituted board. And here I am at issue with Mr. Ponsonby on one point. I think we ought not to confine the constituency to the communicants, by which we should establish a congregational rather than a parochial constituency. Mr. Ponsonby does not, indeed, tell us whether he includes female communicants in his electoral body. I imagine not; for if so, we shall run the risk of being brought under what is called in the vulgar tongue, "petticoat government." But I am not anxious to see the re-imposition in any form of a communicant's test. Should we, then, adopt the old qualification of paying rates and residing in the parish? Although I should not personally object to this return to the old lines, yet it is clear that since the abolition of Church rates, ratepayers have ceased to have the claim to vote in Church matters which they previously had. But if we are to take a Church basis, how are we to define a churchman? I confess that I can arrive at no other satisfactory

definition than that of a *baptized* person. By baptism persons become members of the Church; and although it has been truly said that those who are not communicants have not taken up their full privileges, yet, unless they have been formally and officially excommunicated, what right have I, or anyone else, to exclude them from the exercise of their rights as churchmen? They have disobeyed the rubric, which enjoins at least three communions a year, but unless the Church has taken formal cognisance of their disobedience, no individual priest has a right to treat them as excommunicate. One word on a point referred to by Lord Beauchamp. The expression used by Sir G. Rickards, that if the Church is to retain her position, she must "satisfy the consciences of the people," may not be a happy, or quite a correct one; but this I believe from my heart, that no religion can be true which does not *commend* itself to the consciences of the people. It is because the truths of the Gospel commended themselves to the consciences of the people, first in one country and then in another, that the great Catholic Church has grown up and spread throughout the world. Mr. Ponsonby laid stress on the fact that he found perfect unanimity amongst the members of his council. Considering the way in which it is constituted, I am not surprised to hear it. But we do not want unanimity. If we are really to get at the minds of the laity, we must expect differences of opinion; and we wish to elicit them, and to learn from them, and to find out what is best for the parish. We do not wish for absolute unanimity. By all means let us have unity in essentials; in non-essentials liberty (I had almost said diversity); in all things charity.

The Rev. Henry Hayman, D.D., Rector of Aldingham, Lancashire.

There are just two points on which I wish to say a few words. Discipline must in some measure be restored before we can restore the rights of the laity; but if we look round the world we shall find no Church in which the effacement of discipline has gone to such an extent as it has in the Church of England. In other Churches you will find the laity enjoying legalised functions; but their discipline is a real power, whereas with us it is a blank. The Canons of 1604 declare that our synods are the Church of England by representation, not because they contain proctors who represent the clerical constituencies, but because the clergy as a whole represent the laity as a whole. If we look into the New Testament, we will find no single example of the laity sitting in synod with the clergy, or having any conciliar expression of opinion; but we do find that the laity had something to do with the election of the clergy, and because this right of the laity has been lost, the laity do not recognise the clergy as their proper representatives. If we wish to give an opportunity of expression of opinion to the laity, we must revive the real palladium of their liberties. "Look *ye* out among you seven men of honest report, full of the Holy Ghost and wisdom, whom *we* may appoint over this business" (*Acts* vi. 3). We know that St. Paul addressed those Ephesian elders at Miletus (*Acts* xx) as the representatives of the laity. The early Church gave the amplest interpretation to this principle. Bingham states that the laity had a voice and suffrage in electing the clergy, who with them elected the bishop. This is the direction in which the restoration of lay rights should be sought. It may be probably impossible to effect it—might be even ruinous to attempt it—until discipline be in some measure a reality. But meanwhile let us set up no novel machinery to thwart it, which the attempt to give conciliar expression to the lay voice would do. That would in effect set the laity in rivalry to the clergy by novel and unauthorised representatives, competing, and perhaps conflicting, with their proper representatives, who are the clergy. At the same time, every layman who has gifts of wisdom, knowledge, and experience, may be called in by the bishop to assist the deliberations of the clergy in synod; and thus all the gifts of all her members may be drawn upon by the Church for the benefit of all. This is what all history testifies as the rule in the purest ages; but you will search all the ages in vain for any example of synodical rights exercised by the laity. Those rights as much belong to the clergy as do the ministration of the Word and Sacraments, and no attempt should be made to co-ordinate with them those who have not their responsibilities.

The Ven. W. EMERY, Archdeacon and Canon of Ely; Permanent Secretary of Church Congresses.

I DESIRE to say a little on this subject, having had a good deal to do with diocesan conferences and like organisations in the last few years. With respect to parochial councils, it is most desirable these should be voluntary councils composed of the laity in the parishes; but that is a very different thing from Church boards imposed upon every parish by Parliament. To avoid the latter, I would urge the clergy, as was urged in Congress years ago, to lose no time in promoting the former. Passing to the diocese, it does seem to me that we have attained in the conferences much which Dr. Hayman desiderates in having diocesan synods. I know that the Right Rev. Prelate of Salisbury calls his conference a synod, but that synod is composed of laity as well as clergy, and so differs much from others views of synods as mainly or wholly clerical. Dr. Hayman says, "Don't let us go into new lines, lest we may not be able to get back to the old lines," but I urge that it is wise to do now what appears to be practicable, even though it lack theoretical perfection. For 23 years I have been working to get some sort of council of the bishops in which the laity should be represented, and which should be so recognised by the Church. At the first Church Congress at Cambridge I got a friend to read a paper on diocesan synods, and personally am quite ready to see such clerical bodies called when the bishops see their way to take this step. What we have done now for the present necessities is to establish diocesan conferences; and although they are not synods proper, as some urge, still they are doing a great deal of good, and it would be a great mistake to set them aside while we wait, it may be for a century, for the return of the old synods. Each diocese has its own wants to consider, and I have no doubt experience will show how the present conferences may be improved and brought, it may be, into greater uniformity of organisation. It is greatly to be desired that the laity should serve actively on these diocesan conferences with the clergy, not only for the good of their own dioceses but for the whole Church. With regard to Convocation the general view is, I gather, to let it alone, except to improve it as the clerical representative of the Church of England. Convocation has a legal *status* which cannot be assumed by newer bodies, though I see no difficulty in Convocation advising voluntarily with a body of lay representatives, as I ventured to urge at the Croydon Congress. Meanwhile, till something better is carried out, the Central Council of Diocesan Conferences, originated in 1881, may well be encouraged and strengthened. To this central council 26 of the dioceses have now agreed to send up clerical and lay representatives to gather up the views both of the clergy and laity throughout the two provinces, as specially expressed in the several conferences. What I seriously urge is, don't let us stop the practical working of such organisations, which enable us to tide over the difficulties of the present day, because we deem them imperfect, and believe we think we know of something more theoretically perfect. Mr. S. Leighton in his paper touched an important point when he alluded to churchmen in Parliament. It is a very important thing that laymen, conservative and liberal—without regard to party politics so far as the Church is concerned—should work with the clergy both for the spiritual efficiency of the Church and for its improved relations with the State. The practical organisations now existing in the various dioceses will, I trust, help to this. They are in great part due to Church Congresses, and although they are not so perfect as some would wish, yet, duly and thoroughly worked, they will go very far to unite the faithful of all shades of politics and opinions of the laity in defending the rights of the national Church and promoting her holy mission.

The Rev. ROBERT GREGORY, Canon of St. Paul's.

I MERELY want to protest against two revolutionary proposals which were made by Sir George Rickards. First, with respect to Convocation. Sir George Rickards says that because Convocation after having been silenced so long has not yet been able to do all that it is thought it ought to have done, it should be abolished, and a new body set up in its place. But it has not been shown that this brand new Brummagen scheme would work better than the old one. I should like to know what this new body will effect which Convocation has not effected. It is the old story. If a military man fails, then every civilian thinks he could have done better;

when a doctor lets a patient die, there are always plenty of people who could tell him what he ought to have done, although they are quite ignorant of medicine, and so we have a good man ready to abolish Convocation because it has not done all that he thinks it ought to have done, and which if he had taken the trouble to examine the conditions under which it has to work, he might have known that it was impossible for it to have done. Sir George Rickards would really abolish Convocation because by introducing the lay element into what has been a clerical body for a thousand years, he would make it an entirely different body from what it has ever been. If Sir George Rickards thinks the clergy are such a pack of noodles that the matter should be taken out of their hands, I must suppose that he is conscious of being much wiser than they are, and that he has formed some idea of what he would put in their place that would do well and successfully what they are unable to accomplish, and I should be obliged to him if he will give us his recipe. I should be glad if he would kindly instruct us what would effect all the great improvements which he tells us are so necessary. My own impression is, that the moment Sir George Rickards assumed the character of a constructive, instead of a destructive, philosopher, he would find so many objections brought against his scheme, that if he did not say, everybody else would, the old plan is, after all, the best. As a rule, new plans are worse than the old, and the schemes fashioned by amateurs are, I think I might say, invariably found to injure and not to improve. Then he has told us that the Church is in a minority of one to three; but if that is so, why do the nonconformists always refuse to allow a religious census to be taken? If the nonconformists were more numerous than churchmen, we should have had the fact proved long ago by official tables; but it is because it is not so that the allegation, resting upon nothing but assertions that are always proved to be erroneous whenever they are examined by any data within reach, has not been tested. I want you to get rid of the idea that any reconstruction is everything. We want the hearts of men to be regenerated; we want men to set their affections upon things above, and until we can secure that, the majority will be as it is at present, on the side of the selfish and the worldly, while true Church feeling is on the side of the minority.

CONGRESS HALL,

TUESDAY EVENING, OCTOBER 2ND.

The Right Rev. the PRESIDENT in the Chair.

RECENT ADVANCES IN BIBLICAL CRITICISM AND IN HISTORICAL DISCOVERY, IN THEIR RELATION TO THE CHRISTIAN FAITH.

(*a*) BIBLICAL CRITICISM.
(*b*) HISTORICAL DISCOVERY.

PAPERS.

The Rev. T. K. CHEYNE, Rector of Tendring.

"MY own conviction," said the late Dr. Pusey, "has long been that the hope of the Church of England is in mutual tolerance." That truly great man was not thinking of the new school of Old Testament critics; and yet, if the Anglican Church is ever to renovate her

theology, and to become in any real sense undeniably the Church of the future, she cannot afford to be careless or intolerant of attempts to modernise our methods of criticism and exegesis. It would no doubt be simpler to content ourselves with that criticism and exegesis, and consequently with that theology, which have been fairly adequate to the wants of the past; but are we sure that Jesus Christ would not now lead us a few steps further on towards "all the truth," and that one of His preparatory disciplines may not be a method of Biblical criticism which is less tender to the traditions of the scribes, and more in harmony with the renovating process which is going on in all other regions of thought? Why, indeed, should there not be a providence even in the phases of Old Testament criticism, so that where some can see merely the shiftings of arbitrary opinion, more enlightened eyes may discern a veritable progress, leading at once to fresh views of history, and to necessary reforms in our theology, making this theology simpler and stronger, deeper and more truly Catholic, by making it more Biblical?

Such is the point of view from which a churchman who believes in his Church ought, as it seems, to regard the advance of Biblical criticism. He knows that his Church owes a debt to the future as well as to the past, and that, if she is a living member of Christ's body, she can harmonise herself with the changed aspects of any department of human knowledge. Christ's Church is founded upon a few great facts, and till criticism claims to have refuted these facts, the Church can afford to be not merely tolerant, but even friendly to the critics, knowing that all truth is sacred, that all truths are connected, and that no truth can be lost.

Someone, however, may ask, Does not modern criticism actually claim to have refuted the fundamental facts of Bible history? But which *are* these fundamental facts? Bishop Thirlwall, twenty years ago, told his clergy "that a great part of the events related in the Old Testament has no more apparent connection with our religion than those of Greek and Roman history." Put these events for a moment on one side, and how much more conspicuous does that great elementary fact become which stands up as a rock in Israel's history—namely, that a holy God, for the good of the world, chose out this people, isolating it more and more completely for educational purposes from its heathen neighbours, and interposing at various times to teach, to chastise, and to deliver it! It is not necessary to prove that all such recorded interpositions are in the strictest sense historical; it is enough if the tradition or the record of some that are so did survive the great literary as well as political catastrophe of the Babylonian Captivity. And I have yet to learn that the Exodus, the destruction of Sennacherib's army, the restoration of the Jews to their own land, and the unique phenomenon of spiritual prophecy, are called in question even by the most advanced school of Biblical criticism. One fact, indeed, there is, regarded by some of us as fundamental, which these advanced critics do maintain to be disproved, and that is the giving of the Levitical law by Moses; or, if not by Moses, by persons in the pre-exile period who had prophetic sanction for giving it. Supposing the theory of Kuenen and Wellhausen to be correct, it will no doubt appear to some minds (1) that the inspiration of the Levitical law is at any rate

weakened in quality thereby, (2) that a glaring inconsistency is introduced into the Divine teaching of Israel, which becomes anti-sacrificial at one time, and sacrificial at another, and (3) that room is given for the supposition that the Levitical system itself was an injurious though politic condescension to popular tastes, and consequently (as Lagarde ventures to hold), that St. Paul, by his doctrine of the Atonement, ruined, so far as he could, the simple Gospel of Jesus Christ.

But I only mention these possible inferences in order to point out how unfair they are. 1. The inspiration (to retain an often misused but indispensable term) of the Levitical law is only weakened in any bad sense if it be maintained that the law, whenever the main part of it was promulgated, failed to receive the sanction of God's prophetic interpreters, and that it was not, in the time of Ezra, the only effectual instrument for preserving the deposit of spiritual religion. 2. With regard to the inconsistency (assuming the new hypothesis) between the two periods of the Divine teaching of Israel, the feeling of a devout though advanced critic would be that he was not a fit judge of the providential plan. Inconsistent conclusions on one great subject (that of forgiveness of sins) might, in fact, be drawn from the language of our Lord Himself at different periods of His ministry, though the parallel may not be altogether complete, since our Lord never used directly anti-sacrificial language. And it might be urged on the side of Kuenen, that neither would the early prophets have used such language—at any rate in the literary version of their discourses—if they had foreseen the canonical character which this would assume, and the immense importance of a sacrificial system in the post-exile period. 3. The theory that the law involves an injurious condescension is by no means compulsory upon advocates of the new hypothesis. Concessions to popular tastes have, indeed, as we know but too well, often almost extinguished the native spirit of a religion; but the fact that some, at least, of the most spiritual psalms are acknowledged to be post-exile, ought to make us all, critics and non-critics alike, slow to draw too sharp a distinction between the legal and the evangelical. That the law was misused by some, and in course of time became spiritually almost obsolete, would not justify us in depreciating it, even if we thought that the lesser and not the greater Moses, the scribe and not the prophet, was mainly responsible for its promulgation. Finally, the rash statement of Lagarde has been virtually answered by the reference of another radical critic (Keim) to the well-attested words of Christ at the institution of the Eucharist (Matt. xxvi. 28).

I have spoken thus much on the assumption that the hypothesis of Kuenen and Wellhausen may be true. That it will ever become universally prevalent is improbable—the truth may turn out to lie between the two extremes; but that it will go on for some time gaining ground among the younger generation of scholars is, I think, almost certain. No one who has once studied this or any other Old Testament controversy from the inside, and with a full view of the evidence, can doubt that the traditional accounts of many of the disputed books rest on a very weak basis; and those who crave for definite solutions, and cannot bear to live in twilight, will naturally hail such clear-cut hypotheses as those of Kuenen and Wellhausen, and (like this year's Bampton Lecturer) credit them with an undue finality. Let us be

patient with these too sanguine critics, and not think them bad churchmen, as long as they abstain from drawing those dangerous and unnecessary inferences of which I have spoken. It is the want of an equally intelligent interest which makes the Old Testament a dead letter to so many highly orthodox theologians. If the advanced critics succeed in awakening such an interest more generally, it will be no slight compensation for that "unsettlement of views" which is so often the temporary consequence of reading their books.

One large part, however, of Kuenen and Wellhausen's critical system is not peculiar to them, but accepted by the great majority of professed Old Testament critics. It is this part which has, perhaps, a still stronger claim to be considered in its relation to Christian truth, because there is every appearance that it will in course of time become traditional among those who have given up the still current traditions of the synagogue. I refer (1) to the analysis of the Pentateuch and the Book of Joshua into several documents, (2) to the view that many of the laws contained in the Pentateuch arose gradually according to the needs of the people; and that Ezra, or at least contemporaries of Ezra, took a leading part in the revision and completion of the law-book, and (3) to the dating of the original documents or compilations at various periods, mostly long subsequent to the time of Moses. Time forbids me to enter into the grounds for the confident assertion that if either exegesis or the Church's representation of religious truth is to make any decided progress, the results of the literary analysis of the Pentateuch must be accepted as facts, and that theologians must in future recognise at least three different sections, and as many different conceptions of Israel's religious development, within the Pentateuch, just as they have long recognised at least three different types of teaching in the Old Testament as a whole. On the question as to the date of these sections, and as to the Mosaic origin of any considerable part of them, the opinions of special scholars within the Church will for a long time yet be more or less divided. There is, I know, a belief growing up among us that the Assyrian and Egyptian discoveries are altogether favourable to the ordinary English view of the dates of the historical books, including the Pentateuch. May I be pardoned for expressing the slowly-formed conviction that apologists in England (and be it observed that I do not quarrel with the conception of apologetic theology) frequently indulge in general statements as to the bearings of recent discoveries which are only half true? The opponents of whom they are thinking are long since dead; it is wasting time to fight with the delusions of a past age. No one now thinks the Bible an invention of priestcraft; that which historical critics doubt is the admissibility of any unqualified assertion of the strict historicalness of all the details of all its component parts. This doubt is not removed by recent archæological discoveries, the critical bearings of which are sometimes what neither of the critical schools desired or expected. I refer especially to the bearings of Assyrian discoveries on the date of what are commonly called the Jehovistic narratives in the first nine chapters of Genesis. I will not pursue this subject further, and merely add (the next speaker but two will, I think, perceive the drift of my remarks) that we must not too hastily assume that the supplement-hypothesis is altogether antiquated.

The results of the anticipated revolution in our way of looking at the Pentateuch strike me as fourfold.

1. Historically. The low religious position of most of the pre-exile Israelites will be seen to be not the result of a deliberate rebellion against the law of Jehovah, the Levitical laws being at any rate virtually non-existent. By this I mean, that even if any large part of those laws go back to the age of Moses, they were never thoroughly put in force, and soon passed out of sight. Otherwise, how can we account for this among other facts, that Deuteronomy, or the main part of it, is known in the reign of Josiah as "*The* law of Moses?" We shall also, perhaps, get a deeper insight into the Divine purpose in raising up that colossal personage, who, though "slow of speech," was so mighty in deed—I mean Moses, and shall realise those words of a writer specially sanctioned by my own University, "Should we have an accurate idea of the purpose of God in raising up Moses, if we said, He did it that He might communicate a revelation? Would not this be completely to misunderstand the principal end of the mission of Moses, which was the establishment of the Theocracy, and, in so far as God revealed through him, the revelation was but a means to this higher end." *

2. We shall, perhaps, discriminate more between the parts of the Old Testament, some of which will be chiefly valuable to us as bringing into view the gradualness of Israel's education, and as giving that fulness to our conceptions of Biblical truths which can only be got by knowing the history of their outward forms; others will have only that interest which attaches even to the minutest and obscurest details of the history of much-honoured friends or relatives; others, lastly, will rise, in virtue of their intrinsic majesty, to a position scarcely inferior to that of the finest parts of the New Testament itself.

(3) As a result of what has thus been gained, our idea of Inspiration will become broader, deeper, and more true to facts.

(4) We shall have to consider our future attitude towards that Kenotic view of the person of Christ which has been accepted in some form by such great exegetical theologians as Hofmann, Oehler, and Delitzsch. Although the Logos, by the very nature of the conception, must be omniscient, the incarnate Logos, we are told, pointed His disciples to a future time in which they should do greater works than He Himself, and should open the doors to fresh departments of truth. The critical problems of the Old Testament did not then require to be settled by Him, because they had not yet come into existence. Had they emerged into view in our Lord's time, they would have given as great a shock to devout Jews as they have done to devout Christians, and our Master would no doubt have given them a solution fully adequate to the wants of believers. In that case, a reference to some direction of the law as of Mosaic origin would, in the mouth of Christ, have been decisive; and the Church would no doubt have been guided to make some distinct definition of her doctrine on the subject.

Thus in the very midst of the driest critical researches we can feel that, if we have duly fostered the sense of divine things, we are on the

---

* Article on "Miracles," *Christian Remembrancer*, October, 1863. Recommended by the Oxford Board of Theological Studies.

road to further disclosures of religious as well as historical truths. The day of negative criticism is past, and the day of a cheap ridicule of all critical analysis of ancient texts, is, we may hope, nearly past also. In faith and love the critics, whose lot I would fain share, are at one with many of those who suspect and perhaps ridicule them: in the aspirations of hope their aim is higher. Gladly would I now pass on to a survey of the religious bearings of the critical study of the poetical and prophetical books, which, through differences of race, age, and above all spiritual atmosphere, we find upon the whole so much more attractive and congenial than the Levitical legislation. Let me at least throw out a few hints. Great as is the division of opinion on points of detail, so much appears to be generally accepted that the number of prophets whose works have partly come down to us is larger than used to be supposed. The analysis of the texts may not be as nearly perfect as that of the Pentateuch, but there is no doubt among those of the younger critics whose voices count (and with the pupils of Delitzsch the case is the same as with those of Ewald), that several of the prophetical books are made up of the works of different writers, and I even notice a tendency among highly orthodox critics to go beyond Ewald himself, and analyse the Book of Daniel into portions of different dates. The result is important, and not for literary history alone. It gives us a much firmer hold on the great principle that a prophet's personal horizon is that of his own time, that he prophesied, as has been well said, into the future, but not directly to the future. This will, I believe, in no wise affect essential Christian truth, but will certainly modify our exegesis of certain Scripture proofs of Christian doctrine, and is, perhaps, not without a bearing on the two grave theological subjects referred to already.

Bear with me if once again in conclusion I appeal to the Church at large on behalf of those who would fain modernise our criticism and exegesis, with a view to a not less distinctively Christian, but a more progressive Church-theology. The age of œcumenical councils may have passed, but if criticism, exegesis, and philosophy are only cultivated in a fearless but reverent spirit, and if the Church at large troubles itself a little more to understand the workers and their work, an approximation to agreement on great religious questions may hereafter be attained. What the informal decisions of the general Christian consciousness will be, it would be impertinent to conjecture. It is St. John's "all truth" after which we may aspire—"all the truth" concerning God, the individual soul, and human society, into which the labours of generations, encouraged by the guiding star, shall by degrees introduce us. But one thing is too clear to be mistaken, viz., that exegesis must decide first of all what essential Christian truth is, before a devout philosophy can interpret, expand, and apply it, and Old Testament exegesis, at any rate, cannot be long separated from its natural ally, the higher criticism. A provisional separation may no doubt be necessary, but the ultimate aim of successive generations of students must be a faithful exegesis, enlightened by a seven-times tested criticism.

The Rev. W. SANDAY, Ireland Professor, Oxford.

IT fell to my lot early in the present year to deliver an Inaugural Lecture on a subject which included that which is now set before me. And as several of the questions raised have since received considerable —and, in some cases, striking—development, I should be glad to be allowed to take up the thread at the point at which it was then left.

Among the subjects bearing upon the criticism of the New Testament, three might be said, from our present point of view, to stand out most prominently: (1) Tatian's *Diatessaron*; (2) the quotations from St. John in the writings of Justin Martyr; (3) the recent discussion of the genuineness of 2 St. Peter. To each of these points contributions have been made directly or indirectly.

On the first of them, the recovery of parts of Tatian's *Diatessaron*, I must not take up time by going over again the history of the recovery, but it may be well to recall for a moment what it is, and in what its importance consists.

What we have before us is a Latin version, recently made, of an Armenian version of a commentary by the writer commonly known as Ephraem Syrus, who had his home at Edessa, in the mountains of northern Mesopotamia, and delivered the substance of this commentary in the form of lectures to the pupils who gathered round him, somewhere about 370 A.D. The commentary—a kind of running exposition —is based, not, as would be usually the case, upon any one of the four Gospels, but upon what appears to be a harmony of all four, inasmuch as the texts to which comment is appended are taken first from one, then from another, in the same sort of rough chronological sequence that a harmony would naturally follow. Now the only harmony, properly so called, that is known to have been in existence in the time of Ephraem is that which went by the name of the *Diatessaron*, or Fourfold Gospel, compiled by Tatian the Syrian, at a date which would seem to be most probably fixed at 170—180 A.D. And there are a number of indications which confirm the conclusion thus suggested, that the work upon which Ephraem commented was not a complete collection of our four canonical Gospels (though he was not without a knowledge of these), but Tatian's *Diatessaron*. To the best of my belief, this conclusion is now generally accepted. I am not aware of a single dissentient voice in any direction.

But if this is so—if we have really got back to the original *Diatessaron* —there can be no question that we have to deal with a critical fact of the first importance. It bears upon current controversies in two ways. In the first place it settles, once for all, the questions that have been raised on account of certain ambiguities in the tradition as to the nature of the *Diatessaron* itself. Some critics had gone so far as to identify the *Diatessaron* bodily with the apocryphal *Gospel according to the Hebrews;* and others had maintained the more tenable view that the Gospel according to the Hebrews was either one of the four harmonised, or else a fifth to which the expression *Diapente*, used by Victor of Capua, seemed to point as included in the harmony. These theories have now all been set at rest. It is definitely ascertained that the *Diatessaron* did consist of our four canonical Gospels. Apocryphal additions are not entirely absent, but they are in bulk almost

infinitesimal—according to Dr. Zahn about 1 in 1,000. The Fourth Gospel forms a part of the harmony on precisely the same footing as the rest. It would thus appear that the line of demarcation which separated the canonical from other Gospels was already drawn. Practically we might have inferred as much from Irenæus; but it is a clear gain to have the conclusion confirmed from a wholly distinct geographical region, and at a date which is probably some ten years before that at which Irenæus was writing.

But the significance of this recovery does not stop here. I will not repeat what I have said on another occasion, though only in a very provisional manner, as to its possible bearings upon the history of the text of the Gospels, and as to the evidence which may thus be indirectly afforded of their early and indeed genuinely apostolic origin. The question is complicated by the different media through which the *Diatessaron*, as we have it, has passed. First we have to get at the Syriac text used by Ephraem, and then we have to distinguish between this text as it appeared in Ephraem's hands, and the original Syriac harmony. But then arises the further and still more important question, Did that Syriac harmony proceed directly from Tatian? In other words, Was the *Diatessaron* originally composed in Greek or in Syriac? Was the Syriac harmony used by Ephraem an original work or a translation or adaptation? That the *Diatessaron* was originally written in Greek is the older view, and seems to be adopted by Dr. Hort in his *Introduction*. It is also still maintained by Dr. Harnack. But Dr. Zahn, the indefatigable writer to whom we owe the fullest discussion of the whole subject, contends strenuously for a Syriac original. And so far as I am able to judge on the data before me, this view seems to have the preponderant probability. It is accepted by De Lagarde, and in England by Dr. Wace. We must be careful not to allow the wish to become father to the thought, but if this view should be found ultimately to hold good, and if the further relation, for which Dr. Zahn also contends, between Tatian's *Diatessaron* and the Curetonian Syriac should be established, then far-reaching consequences would follow, and a fatal blow would be struck at not a few destructive theories which now enjoy what I strongly suspect will prove to be an ephemeral popularity.

While I am writing these lines a book has reached me, which promises to throw yet further light upon this interesting problem. It is a fourth volume of the *Analecta Sacra Spicilegii Solesmensis*, published under the auspices of Cardinal Pitra, which contains amongst other matter, an account of an Arabic version of Tatian's *Diatessaron*, which still exists among the MSS. at the Vatican. Dr. Zahn had already called attention to this MS.; and a fuller description of its contents is now given by Father Ciasca in advance of its publication. From this description it is sufficiently clear that the version is really that of the *Diatessaron*, though with rather large interpolations. A complete list is given, showing the order of the extracts from the different Gospels, and a comparison of these with the text commented upon by Ephraem, proves the fundamental identity of the two documents, in spite of some variations, and the much greater fulness of that which is now being made accessible. We shall doubtless have to wait for the publication of the entire MS. before any precise results can be

deduced from it. But the possession of a text, which, instead of being fragmentary, is nearly complete, and which will enable us to control that which we already have, must needs place us in a much better position for argument than we occupy at present.

I fear that I must strike out of the list of documents newly rendered available for the criticism of the New Testament, a Commentary upon the Gospels which Dr. Zahn has been seeking to re-vindicate for Theophilus of Antioch, whose early date—*circa* 180 A.D.—would give to such a work an exceptional importance. The arguments which Dr. Zahn was able to adduce in favour of its genuineness were such as to justify him in re-opening a question that had seemed to be closed, though they left behind some serious difficulties. But Dr. Harnack, in the latest issue of a series parallel to Dr. Zahn's, and itself, too, of high value, not only replies with much force to these arguments, but is able to support his conclusion with new documentary evidence. His attention had been called to a MS. of the Commentary in the Library at Brussels, which is, indeed, the only MS. extant, that from which the *editio princeps* had been taken having been lost. And a preface contained in this MS. proves clearly that the older view is correct, and that the Commentary is not an original work, but a compilation belonging to the sixth century rather than the second. It is significant of the zeal with which these studies are being prosecuted, that while Dr. Zahn's lengthy investigation was published at the beginning of the present year, Dr. Harnack's criticism, occupying some 77 closely-reasoned pages, is dated June 8th, and only came into my hands in time to compel the re-writing of a paragraph already printed in the Congress Report.

The second subject to which I called attention was the quotations from the Fourth Gospel in Justin Martyr. In regard to this, I ventured to claim that the dependence of Justin upon the Gospel, has been made out by Professor James Drummond, in England, and Dr. Ezra Abbot, in America. And I was unable to give assent to the arguments urged upon the other side by my friend Dr. Edwin A. Abbott, of the City of London School. I did not, however, do full justice to the position of the latter writer. I stated his argument briefly, thus :—The use of the Fourth Gospel by Justin, proves knowledge of that Gospel, but the sparing use of it proves doubt and hesitation. It is, however, really rather more than this. The use, as Dr. Abbott contends, of Philo, where the Fourth Gospel would have supplied matter more directly in point, proves, in his opinion, that Justin regarded it as not possessing apostolic authority. I gladly make this correction ; and yet I am afraid that I cannot attach to it all the importance that it might seem to claim. I have been lately reading Justin again, with a view to test the force of this conclusion ; and it is impressed upon me more forcibly than ever that Justin really implies the Fourth Gospel, and implies it, not only on the surface, but deep down in the substance of his thought. Frequently as Justin brings in the Logos doctrine, it is almost always in immediate connexion with the subject of the Incarnation. Page after page, time after time that the one is mentioned, the other immediately follows. ὁ λόγος σὰρξ ἐγένετο seems to be ringing in Justin's ears. But these are the words of St. John and not of Philo. They are indeed quite foreign to his thought ; and Dr. Abbott seems to me to

assume far too easily that Justin would supply the key to his own doctrine for himself. The repeated references to the Trinity of πατήρ, λόγος, πνεῦμα, also show that Justin's doctrine was far more definite, something far more hard and fast than anything that he could have got from Philo. His Christianity is more deeply ingrained. It is not merely adopted, but assimilated. He reproduces the thoughts of St. Paul and St. John without mentioning their names.

The second part of my reply to Dr. Abbott also, I venture to think, holds good. I contend that by the very same method by which he seeks to prove that Justin did not recognise St. John, it is equally easy to prove that he did not recognise St. Paul; and that at a time when his opponent, Marcion, certainly accepted ten of St. Paul's Epistles as authoritative.

Dr. Abbott would doubtless reply that Justin has not the same reason for quoting St. Paul that he has for quoting St. John. There is, perhaps, some little, but I cannot see that there is any great difference. I will venture to say that one is quite as often surprised to see how near Justin can come to St. Paul without actually quoting him, as in the case of St. John. It is part of the general phenomena of Justin's writings. He quotes the Synoptists definitely enough; but he also refrains from quoting them not seldom when their words seem to be almost upon his pen. Dr. Abbott has stated well some of the reasons for this scarcity of quotations from the New Testament; but, I suspect that there may have been other causes in the background—perhaps merely trivial and mechanical causes—which our imperfect knowledge of the circumstances prevents us from fully realising.

I had little idea, when I made use of the argument from Justin's treatment of St. Paul, that the same argument was being employed not far away at the same time, but to a different end. Pupils not seldom distance their masters; and this relation of skirmishers thrown out in advance, has generally been that of Dutch to German theology. It was only last year that a Dutch theologian had the courage to draw the conclusion which I well know that Dr. Abbott would decline. Hitherto, the genuineness of the four great Epistles of St. Paul, Galatians, Romans, 1 and 2 Corinthians, has been taken as an axiom in theological controversy; but Dr. Loman, of Amsterdam, has now called even this in question. And one of the main grounds on which he does so is the absence of any reference to them in the writings of Justin. The express statement of Tertullian that Marcion at the same date accepted ten Epistles, he gets over by saying that he does not believe it, and that Tertullian has probably made a mistake; though how he would deal with the detailed discussion of Marcion's treatment of these Epistles in Tertullian's elaborate reply to him, I do not know.

In the case of Dr. Loman, however, these instances of scepticism were only part of a larger scheme. Dissatisfied with the solutions which Strauss, Renan, Keim, and Hausrath, have offered to account for the origin of Christianity, he propounds a new theory, which would resolve the whole into an idea, and effectually detach it from its supposed connection with a Person. Christianity is to him only a name for the Messianic movements among a section of the Jews. Critics have often explained in this way the famous sentence in which Suetonius accounts for the expulsion of the Jews from Rome. The "Chrestus," to whose instigation

he attributes the riots that broke out among them, has often been taken as a personification of the Messianic hopes by which they were fired. Dr. Loman would extend this explanation to the whole subject matter of the Gospels. But then he finds an insuperable obstacle to this view in St. Paul's four great Epistles. And his next step is to ask himself whether the assumption of their genuineness, in which critics of the most varied schools have hitherto agreed, is really well founded. And here it is that the silence of Justin seems to give him something of a handle.

Strange to say these wild and windy speculations—which come of reading too much about books and too little of the books themselves—have found some adherents, even among the more prominent contributors to the leading Dutch Theological Review. Indeed a division has been introduced into the Liberal camp. The veteran Dr. Scholten, who has hitherto been known rather as the freest of free lances, has entered the field against the new theory, with arguments which are only less cogent than they might have been because he is hampered and crippled by his own antecedents.

I should not, however, have thought it worth while to mention the controversy at all, except, perhaps, as giving a curious glimpse into the state of things among our Dutch neighbours, but that it serves to bring out two points with striking clearness. In one respect Dr. Loman has reason. He has seen more distinctly than his fellows the real incompatibility of St. Paul's great Epistles with the doctrine which they have been teaching. And he has seen also, that the arguments by which they support their rejection of the Gospel of St. John are really just as applicable to the Epistles of St. Paul. So far I accept his arguments entirely. They are just what I should be inclined to urge myself, but I should draw from them an opposite conclusion. Grant me St. Paul's four Epistles—and really it is mere dilettantism and extravagance to doubt them. If these are granted I ask no more: I am ready to put on one side the Gospels, the Acts, and all the other books of the New Testament; and I hold in my hand the proof—as I venture to think, conclusive and overwhelming proof—that Christianity, as it has come down to us, is in all its essential features what we have supposed it to be.

And on that second and minor point, I also think that Dr. Loman has something to say for himself. There *is* something strange in the silence of Justin about St. Paul, just as there is something that we should not altogether expect in the scantiness of his references to the Gospel of St. John. But a thing may be different from our expectations without being any the less a fact. And this fact may be really consistent with other facts, though we cannot lay our finger upon the exact train which establishes the consistency. Of course there is a point at which improbability becomes a negative argument of very considerable force. But I believe that this point is less often reached than some critics are apt to imagine; and the consequence is that they spend a great deal of time in straining out a gnat, while they are swallowing a camel.

I have spoken of Dr. Scholten's protest against the reckless destructiveness of some of his countrymen, and equally noticeable in its way, is a similar protest by a thoroughly independent German scholar, Dr. P. W. Schmidt, who has had charge of the latest edition of some of the epistles in Meyer's *Commentary*. He published about three

years ago a reply entitled, *Hypercriticism on the New Testament (Neutestamentliche Hyperkritik)*, to an article impugning the genuineness of the Epistle to the Philippians by a writer of higher calibre than Scholten's Dutch opponents, Dr. C. Holsten. Dr. Holsten's position was, it is needless to say, different from theirs. It was on the assumption of the genuineness of the four great Epistles that he undertook to prove, by a detailed comparison, that the Epistle to the Philippians differed from these both in style and thought. And Dr. Schmidt, with great justice, as I cannot but think, showed the fundamental weakness and exaggeration of the method pursued. Here, for instance, is a specimen. Dr. Holsten had pointed out that in the Epistle to the Philippians there was a preponderance of substantives over verbs, which was contrary to the usage of St. Paul. In the Epistle to the Philippians he had counted 130 verbs to 147 substantives, whereas, in the recognised epistles he found 722 verbs to 634 substantives. Common-sense is impatient of such arguments; and here common-sense has strict reasoning on its side. For taking the first four chapters of the Epistle to the Romans, Dr. Schmidt found that there were something like 170 substantives to the first 130 verbs. And other parts of his reply were equally successful.

Here, again, I should not have thought the subject worthy of mention from its intrinsic importance, but it lends itself to a wider generalisation. Instances like this of Dr. Holsten's are warnings that there are limits beyond which the linguistic argument cannot safely be used. And it is to be hoped that before very long they may suggest a closer and clearer definition of what those limits are. It is not only upon the negatively critical side that such a definition is needed. Apologetic writers, I am afraid, seem to me not seldom to overstep the bounds of a sober logic, and to rest upon these verbal proofs a weight of conclusion which they are altogether insufficient to bear. I confess that, to my own judgment, the arguments used in the *Speaker's Commentary* to identify the style of 1 and 2 St. Peter, and that of both epistles with the speeches of St. Peter recorded in the Acts of the Apostles, seem to me to come under this description.

Critical enquiries we have on all sides; orthodox as well as heterodox. But the preliminary question has not yet been sufficiently settled—What critical methods are really trustworthy, and how far, or under what conditions, they may be trusted? We are using on both sides weapons that have not been proved, with a result that is too often inconclusiveness and failure.

The mention of 2 St. Peter brings me to the last of the three points to which I proposed to refer—the discussion as to the genuineness of that Epistle. Here, too, the remarks which I made six months ago have received in the interval a somewhat unexpected confirmation. When Dr. Edwin Abbott first communicated to me privately the data, afterwards published in the *Expositor*, on which he based his conclusion that the writer of 2 St. Peter had borrowed from Josephus, and therefore was in any case not the Apostle, I replied, while fully admitting the interest of the parallels quoted, that I thought the method precarious—an expression which was afterwards criticised by Archdeacon Farrar. What I had in my mind was first of all the improbability upon the face of it, that the Christian writer of a hortatory letter, even though living in the

second century, should borrow for the purpose from a Jewish historian; and secondly, the much greater probability that the resemblance should be due to some common teaching in the Jewish schools in which St. Peter, or his secretary, might have participated as well as Josephus. I was not aware at the time, of an elaborate article on 2 St. Peter by an American scholar, Prof. B. B. Warfield, which had been contributed in the January of last year, to the *Southern Presbyterian Review*, and which I am indebted to the kindness of some unknown friend in America for bringing to my notice. Dr. Warfield is a determined and uncompromising defender of St. Peter's authorship, and his treatment of the subject is terse, clear, and incisive, as well as thorough and searching. This writer has since replied at length to Dr. Abbott's strictures, and has done this too with equal ability. Many parts of his argument I cannot help regarding as successful, though as a whole it is still rather too one-sided to allow me to consider the genuineness of the epistle as proved. Between positive proof and negative disproof, there is often a wide interval, and somewhere in this neutral zone the Epistle seems to me to lie.

I have now finished the necessarily brief and hurried review that I set before me. And, imperfect as it is, enough will have been said to show how stirring and active are the times in which we are living. Events move fast in the region of criticism, and it needs an effort to keep pace with them. We seem to be in the midst and on the verge of great discoveries. The more liberal policy which is being pursued at the Vatican at once demands our hearty gratitude, and excites in us eager hope and expectation. We must, of course, be prepared for disappointment both in this and in other directions. After all we are only picking up the gleanings of bygone ages. We are not reaping a harvest on virgin soil. And yet of late the very gleanings have been so rich that we cannot refrain from hoping that those which lie before us in the immediate future may be not less so.

I know that there are some who regard all the activity that is now going on with distrust, and who look forward to the future of New Testament criticism with anxiety. For myself, I am unable to share either of these feelings. We may divide critical enquiries into two classes :— those which turn upon the discovery of new documents and materials, and those which are merely a scrutinising and recombining of materials already existing. Now so far as the first class is concerned I am not aware of a single discovery bearing, however indirectly, on New Testament criticism, that has tended in any way to shake the foundations of our faith, while by far the larger number have tended very positively to strengthen them. The discovery of Cureton's fragments of the Old Syriac Gospels, of the *Codex Sinaiticus*, of the *Codex Rossanensis*, the publication of the *Gigas Holmiensis*, and various fragments of the Old Latin, have an importance which cannot be fully estimated until the analysis of the history of Greek text has been carried a little further, or rather, perhaps, exhibited in a little more detail than it has been at present. The discovery of the missing portions of the so-called Epistles of Clement, and of the fragments of Aristides, added, perhaps, not very much, but subtracted nothing. On the other hand the recovered conclusion of the Clementine Homilies supplied indisputable proof

of the use of the Fourth Gospel. The Armenian version of the Ignatian Epistles seems to be the turning point in the controversy as to their genuineness, and so to decide in favour of the evidence which they contribute. The recently published writings of Aphraates and the *Doctrine of Addai* also furnish evidence somewhat more indirect. And now we have the great event of the appearance of Tatian's *Diatessaron* in two distinct versions. Even the researches of my friend, Dr. Hatch, which may perhaps be quoted against me, I cannot admit to be really so; partly because the point which they touch is not fundamental, and partly because, even if it were, the literary evidence which is old seems to me to more than counterbalance the epigraphical evidence which is new.

But if such is the case, as regards critical discovery, I cannot think that the prospect is any less favourable as regards speculative, analytical, or re-constructive criticism. Here, perhaps, there is more reason for disquiet. Bold and revolutionary hypotheses have been thrown out, and will probably be thrown out again; but, when we look back upon past controversies, we shall see, indeed, that they have left a residuum, but a residuum that leaves Christianity no weaker, but rather stronger than it was before. Errors are corrected; exaggerations are modified; our understanding of the New Testment grows in depth and fulness. And, in the meantime, as it seems to me, certain positions have been placed beyond the reach of controversy. They are so much secure ground from which we can look out in safety, even though there may be obscurity—nay, for a passing moment, darkness and tempest outside. One truth cannot permanently conflict with another truth. And, if we are assured, as we are by a thousand voices, that Christianity, as we have it, is in its essence true, then all the reasoning and debating in the world about things that do not belong to its essence cannot make it otherwise. It is only a matter of time. It must be our processes of reasoning that are at fault. Continue them a little further; test them a little more closely; bring new facts to bear upon them, and in the end they must come out right again.

Some of my hearers will remember a poem of Clough's which begins,

> "It fortifies my soul to know,
> That, though I perish, truth is so."

That should be the attitude in which the Christian approaches criticism. And yet, even so much fortifying is unnecessary. He will not be called upon to "perish" if he seeks for truth patiently and humbly.

Colonel Sir C. W. Wilson, R.E., K.C.M.G., etc.

The most important features of recent Biblical research in Palestine are the discovery of the Siloam inscription, and the survey of a portion of the country East of Jordan, by Capt. Conder and Lieut. Mantell, R.E., for the Palestine Exploration Fund. The Siloam inscription, found accidentally in the rock hewn channel which conducts the water of the Fountain of the Virgin to the Pool of Siloam, records the meeting of the workmen, and the completion of the channel. Its value for philology

and epigraphy is very great, for it not only gives us a form of the Phœnician alphabet of a very early date, and closely resembling that of the Moabite stone, but brings before us the Hebrew language as it was spoken in the age of the Kings. Professor Sayce, who remarks on the Biblical character of the language and the occurrence of Old Testament idioms in the inscription, assigns it to some date between the 8th and 6th centuries B.C., and Professor Neubauer has suggested that the channel was cut in the reign of Ahaz.

The expedition of Capt. Conder and Lieut. Mantell was brought to a premature end by the refusal of the Porte to grant a firman, but not before 500 square miles of country had been surveyed, and plans, drawings, and photographs procured of the principal places of interest. The district examined included Jebel Neba, Mount Nebo, so that we have now detailed plans of the spot whence Moses took his final view of the Promised Land; the plains of Moab on which the Israelites encamped before crossing Jordan, and where, in all probability, the cities of the plain were situated; and the heights from which Balaam looked down on the people he was called upon to curse. It is extremely interesting to find the name Zophim, under the form Tal'at es Sufa, "ascent of Zuph," still lingering on the slopes of Mount Nebo; and not less so to find groups of rude stone monuments near the sites upon which Balaam, probably, erected his three altars. These cromlechs have been noticed by Irby and Mangles, De Saulcy, Duc de Luynes, Dr. Tristram, and other travellers, but until the recent survey, no one was aware of the great number of them scattered over the country East of Jordan, or of the remarkable manner in which they are grouped round certain centres. The survey confirms the identification of Asdoth Pisgah with the "Springs of Moses," and throws much light on many obscure Biblical sites in the vicinity of the Dead Sea; but for these points, and also for an accurate description of the view from the summit of Nebo, I must refer you to the interesting work recently published by Capt. Conder, under the title of "Heth and Moab." The results of the survey are so valuable, that its abrupt termination is a matter for unfeigned regret.

Before crossing the Jordan, Capt. Conder made an excursion from Beirût in search of the great Hittite city of Kadesh, on the Orontes, and believes that he discovered it in Tell Neby Mendeh, on the south slope of which there are ruins still called Kades. Until the last few years the Hittites were only known to us as one of the tribes inhabiting Palestine at the time of the conquest, but recent discovery has shown them to have been a powerful kingdom, or, perhaps more rightly, a confederation of small states, able to hold their own against the great monarchies of Egypt and Assyria, and exercising a wide-spread religious influence, if not dominion, over the people of Asia Minor. In the time of Abraham, the power of the Hittites appears to have extended to the southern limits of Palestine; it is from Ephron the Hittite that he buys the cave of Machpelah, and the bargain is confirmed "in the audience of the children of Heth;" so too it is to the same children of Heth that he bows himself down, an obsequiousness which indicates clearly that they were the ruling race. At the time of the conquest there is a marked change; during the interval the Hittite power in Palestine had been weakened by the campaigns of Thothmes III., Rameses I.,

Sethi I., and Rameses II.; and the Hittites re-appear as a people inhabiting Syria and Northern Palestine, or the country from "Lebanon even unto the great river, the river Euphrates." This decline of Hittite power in the south was followed, apparently, by the rise of the Amorites, a kindred Hamitic race, and by the formation of numerous petty kingdoms, which were never able to form a coalition sufficiently strong to resist the onward march of the compact Israelite force under the leadership of Joshua. The Amorites seem to have spread themselves over a large portion of Palestine; the Kings of Jerusalem, Hebron, Jarmuth, Lachish, and Eglon were Amorite; Sihon and Og, after driving out the Amorites and other peoples, established Amorite kingdoms East of Jordan; and even Kadesh on the Orontes is said to have been an Amorite city, under the jurisdiction of the Hittites, during the reign of Sethi I.

While the conquest of Palestine was being effected by Joshua, the Hittites appear only as the allies of Jabin, King of Hazor; and during the stormy period of the Judges which followed, they are mentioned only as one of the tribes with whom the Israelites intermarried, and as having afforded shelter to the traitor who betrayed Bethel into the hands of the children of Joseph. During the earlier portion of this period occurred the remarkable invasion of Syria by the European nations who, after subduing the Hittites, advanced on Egypt, and were defeated by Rameses III. in Southern Palestine; and there are traces of another disturbance, from which the Hittites probably suffered as much as the Jews, in the conquests of Chushan Rishathaim of Mesopotamia, who held Palestine for eight years. After this the Hittites regained some of their lost power, and in the reign of Tiglath Pileser I., who died 1100 B.C., they were paramount in Northern Syria; that monarch defeated a powerful combination of Hittite tribes, amongst whom the Muski, Karkiya, and Urumiya, were the most important, and subdued the whole country as far as the Mediterranean, upon which he embarked in a ship of Aradus. From this blow the Hittites never fully recovered, and they were soon afterwards forced northwards by the expansion of the Hebrew and Syrian monarchies, which rose to importance during the period of Assyrian decline that followed the death of Tiglath Pileser's son, Samsi-vul. Carchemish henceforward takes the place of Kadesh, as the centre of Hittite influence, and Hamath appears as a small Hittite state—first in alliance with David, and afterwards as tributary to Solomon, who built store cities there. On the death of Solomon, and the break up of his empire, Hamath recovered its independence and the Hittites regained something of their former power; this did not, however, last long, for they and their allies were signally defeated by the Assyrian Kings Assurnazirpal (885-860 B.C.) and Shalmanezer II. (859-824 B.C.) From the latter date the history of the Hittites, as gathered from the Assyrian records, is one of constant revolt and cruel repression, until the final overthrow by Sargon, who took Carchemish 717 B.C., led the people away captive, and appointed Assyrian governors over the country. The most striking events of this period are the three years' siege of Arpad by Tiglath Pileser II., and the same monarch's campaign against the King of Hamath and his ally Azariah, or Uzziah, King of Judah.

Little is known of the Hittite power in Asia Minor; it was probably

at its height in the 14th century B.C., but must have been profoundly shaken by the great victory of Rameses II. at Kadesh, which, according to the striking epic of the contemporary court poet Pentaur, broke "the back of the Khita for ever and ever." The tendency of such a defeat must at any rate have been to weaken the influence of the Hittites over the Mysians, Lycians, Dardanians, and other tribes of Western Anatolia, who fought with them on that occasion. It would appear, from the Assyrian records, that the Hittites gradually split up into a number of independent tribes or states, such as the Cilicians, Moschians, Tibarenians, Comanians, the people of Commagene, and others, who are mentioned in the annals of the wars of Sargon and his successors; the final extinction of their power, however, appears to have been due to the inroads of the Cimmerians and Scythians; and they afterwards formed part of the Median empire, which extended to the Halys. So complete was their overthrow, that even their distinctive name was lost, and they appear in Herodotus and Strabo as Leuco-Syrians, Cappadocians, Cataonians, etc. The wide-spread influence of the Hittites may, however, be gathered from their monuments; the inscriptions on the monument at Karabel, the Sesostris of Herodotus, on the old road from Sardis to Ephesus, and near the Niobe in the Valley of the Hermus, show that they penetrataed to the Ægean, and there are certain indications that Sardis was once in their hands. The next monuments are those at Giaour Kalessi, between Sivrihissar and Angora; and then follow the interesting remains at Boghazkeui, near Yuzgat. The ruins at Boghazkeui, of which Herr Humann, so well known from his excavations at Pergamos, made a plan last year, are quite unlike those of an ancient Greek city; they cover a wide extent of ground, and have more in common with cities like Babylon and Nineveh, than with the typical Greek city gathered round its acropolis. The walls are still standing to a considerable height, and there are underground means of exit which offer several interesting features; there are also the foundations of a large temple, constructed of massive stones jointed together in a peculiar manner; and a long inscription in which, though almost obliterated, several Hittite symbols are distinctly visible. The rock sculptures, of which casts were taken by Herr Humann, are a series of religious representations with Hittite symbols above the gods and goddesses; the majority of the figures are female, and amongst them are twelve of the armed Amazons who played such an important part in the religious worship of Asia Minor. In one figure can be recognised the "effeminate character, the soft outlines, the long sweeping dress, the ornaments of the eunuch high priest of Cybele;" and in another the warlike goddess Cybele. Not far from Boghazkeui are the ruins of Uyuk, with the curious sphinxes which, though made after an Egyptian model, differ widely from the Egyptian type. Uyuk is interesting as the only instance of what may be called a Hittite mound building in Anatolia; and shows us that, contrary to the practice in Assyria, the Hittites placed their sculptures so as to face outwards. To this peculiarity of construction is probably due the almost universal selection of trachyte or basalt for the sculptures instead of a softer stone; the only exception is, I believe, at Jerablûs, where some of the slabs are of limestone. In Pontus there are traces of Hittite art in two

small slabs, which I found at Kaisariych, but which came originally from the neighbourhood of Amasia. At Iflatûn Bûnar, near the Lake of Beischeher, there is a large monument of Hittite origin; and at Ivriz, near Eregli, there is a well-preserved rock-hewn monument, representing a thanksgiving to the god who gives fertility to the earth. "The god is a husbandman, marked as giver of corn and wine by his attributes; and the gorgeous raiment of the suppliant priest, praying for a blessing upon the country and people, is purposely contrasted with the plain garments of the god." The god wears the very dress still used by the peasantry of Anatolia; the high peaked cap is still in use among some of the Kurdish tribes; the tunic fastened round the waist by a girdle is the present loose garment with its kummerbund; and the tip-tilted shoes are the ordinary sandals of the country, with exactly the same bandages and mode of fastening. The sandal is very like the Canadian mocassin, and the long bandage wound round the foot and ankle is the equivalent of the blanket sock; it is the best possible covering for the foot in a country where the cold in winter is intense, and the snow lies on the ground for a long period; and as it appears on all Hittite monuments, I think it is an evidence of the northern origin of the Hittites. It is interesting also to notice that some of the patterns on the priest's dress have not yet gone out of fashion amongst the Cappadocian peasantry. At Bor, between Eregli and Nigdeh, Mr. Ramsay, whilst travelling with me last year, discovered a new inscription which, unlike all other Hittite texts hitherto known, is incised and not in relief; near the silver mines in the Bulghur Dagh is another inscription, and at the mouth of a curious gorge close to Gurun, near the head waters of an arm of the Euphrates, I found two others. It is, however, south of the Taurus, between that range and Aleppo, and eastward to the Euphrates, that the most numerous traces of the Hittites are to be found; near the eastern extremity of the Bagtché Pass, by which Darius crossed Mount Amanus, when he came down in rear of Alexander's army before the battle of Issus, I visited a large mound on which a long row of Hittite sculptures, representing a hunting scene with great spirit, was standing "in situ," here as at Uyuk facing outwards; a few miles beyond, on the road to Aintab, I saw other sculptures taken from one of the mounds. The district between the Giaour Dagh (Amanus) and the Kurt Dagh contains a large number of mounds; in a small area I counted eight, which I feel sure would well repay excavation. The slabs are all small and could be easily conveyed to the coast, but, unfortunately, the British Museum has not seen its way to excavate; and the question is now, I believe, being taken up by the Germans. At Marasch, near the foot of the Taurus, several Hittite slabs have been found, and between Aintab and Aleppo, and towards the Euphrates, there are many large mounds, evidently of Hittite origin, including Tell Erfad, Arpad, and Azaz, the Khazaz of the Assyrian monuments. Several slabs have reached this country from Jeralbus, but the excavations at that place, owing to want of skill and inexperience, have not been so fruitful in their results as might have been expected. Jerablus is generally identified with Carchemish, but unless a distinct statement is found in the Assyrian inscriptions that that city was on the Euphrates, I would place it at Membij, the ancient Hierapolis, a site which impressed me more than any other I visited west

of the Euphrates. Hittite inscriptions have also been found at Aleppo and Hamath, and I think the slab obtained for the Palestine Exploration Fund from Tell Salhiych, near Damascus, is also Hittite.

A few words may now be said of the origin, religion, language, etc., of the Hittites. I fully agree with Prof. Sayce in considering that the Hittites of Northern Syria and Palestine were intruders, and that they came from the Anatolian Plateau east of the Halys, which was occupied by Hittite tribes from the Black Sea to the Mediterranean. This view of their northern origin is supported by their physical appearance, as depicted on the monuments, by the mocassin sandal already noticed, and by the fingerless glove, which is still commonly used by the peasantry, and is found in all cold countries. The sculptures show that the Hittites did not belong to a Semitic race. The features are rather those of a northern people, and on the Temple of Abusimbel the Khita have a very Scythic character, with shaven hair and a single lock from the crown. This peculiarity in the mode of dressing the hair is not seen on the Hittite monuments, but at Karnak and Thebes I noticed figures with the same type of feature as those on the monuments in Anatolia. It would be very interesting, and I hope it may be done some day, to obtain casts of the various types of face represented in the war pictures of Rameses II.; they are very varied, and a careful comparison could not fail to be of value. Amongst some pottery dug up at Tarsus about thirty-five years ago, is a head, which seems to have been a likeness of a Hittite, as it gives the full lips, and the large thick nose, with a sharp curve at the end, which is found on the monuments. The type, which is not a beautiful one, is still found in some parts of Cappadocia, especially amongst the people living in the extraordinary subterranean towns which I discovered, last year, beneath the great plain north west of Nigdeh. The religious belief of the Hittites, and its influence on the people of Western Anatolia, and through them on the Turks, has been described, as far as it is known, in papers by Prof. Sayce and Mr. Ramsay. I would only suggest now, as a subject for examination, how far the peculiar religious rites and observances at the two Comanas were of Hittite origin; at each place the priest was at least co-ordinate with the King in rank and religious power, as appears to have been the case with the Hittites; and at Amasia the most magnificent tomb is that of a high priest. I do not know whether there was any peculiarity in the faith professed by the early Christians of Cappadocia, but it may be more than a mere coincidence that the country between Boghazkeui and Comana Pontica is inhabited by an indigenous people who, nominally Moslems, profess a religion which, as far as I could learn, approaches more nearly that of the Ansariych than any other. That the Hittites had made considerable progress in art, is attested by their monuments, and we may infer from the fact that before the Cimmerian invasion, Sinope was one of the principal outlets for the produce of the East, that they were a commercial people; the trade route seems to have passed through the Cilician gates to Kaisariych, and thence by Boghazkeui to Sinope. It would appear from the proper names on the Assyrian and Egyptian monuments, that the Hittites did not speak a Semitic language; the language was probably that of the Leuco-Syrians and Cataonians, and allied to the "speech of Lycaonia" which was in use in the time of St. Paul, and it possibly

lingered on until the complete Hellenisation of the people under the Byzantine Empire. Little progress has yet been made in deciphering the inscriptions, but there is every reason to hope that success will attend the efforts of Prof. Sayce and other workers in that direction, and we shall then have a flood of light thrown upon a people with whom the Israelites at one time intermarried, whose religion some of them adopted, and with whose history that of the Jewish monarchy was, on several occasions, intimately connected.

In conclusion, I would draw your attention to an expedition which the Palestine Exploration Fund is sending to the East this month. The expedition will be under the guidance of the distinguished geologist, Prof. Hull, Director of the Geological Survey of Ireland; Capt. Kitchener, who has done good work in Palestine, will be associated with him, and pay special attention to topographical questions; Prof. Hull will be accompanied by three gentlemen, who will devote their attention to special branches of science. The object of the expedition is, in the first place, to obtain a conclusive report on the geology of the Dead Sea basin, which has such an important bearing on the site of the Cities of the Plain; in the second, to determine the route followed by the Israelites after they left Sinai, and the pass by which they ascended to the desert of the Tih; in the third, to try and recover the sites of Elath and Eziongeber; in the fourth, to search for Kadesh-barnea, and determine the southern boundary of the Promised Land, and the boundary of Edom; and lastly, to examine the geology of Palestine itself. If but one or two of these objects can be thoroughly accomplished, a great addition will be made to our knowledge of the topography of the Bible. The Palestine Exploration Fund, and its system of working, is now well known, and I would only here express a hope that liberal subscriptions may be forthcoming to support an expedition which I confidently recommend to the notice of every student of the Bible.

The Rev. Henry George Tomkins, late Vicar of Branscombe.

The topic prescribed for me is "The bearing of Egyptology, in its most recent phase, on the Bible." I would first say this: that to show the bearing of Egyptology on the Bible is rather to prove, by innumerable small coincidences, that which Ebers has so well called the *Egypticity* of the Pentateuch, than to establish any particular historical point by external and monumental evidence. But that function of Egyptology is a very important one indeed. For instance, the life of Joseph is supported at every point in the strongest probability by the parallel between the Egyptian monuments and the record in the Bible. I will not, however, take up much of your time in arguments this evening. I would point out that in the main, roughly speaking, the Delta of the Nile is almost the Biblical Egypt. We have so little in the Bible beyond the Delta, that we may say that the Delta is almost the Egypt of the Bible. I will now take three points in the Delta. The first is that of the Biblical Zoan, the Sán of the present day, where the immense ruin-heaps are waiting to be explored. Here, already, the results of comparatively superficial examination by Mariette are so very important, in having recovered the sculptures of the "Shepherd Kings," that

we may expect something still more important from a thorough search of the ruins. The "Field of Zoan" of the Bible is called by the same expression in Egyptian records. The Field of Zoan was the scene of the great wonders which God performed by the hand of Moses. I do not think that Zoan is, as Brugsch supposes, the Zar of the Egyptian monuments. But now we will come to that point—to the place called Zar or Zaru on the Egyptian monuments, and here we come upon a very curious Biblical coincidence. In the 13th chapter of the Book of Genesis, where is described Lot's choice of the Jordan plain, it says: "The plain was well watered everywhere, even as the garden of the Lord, like the land of Egypt as thou comest unto [when thou enterest] Zoar." But there is very strong reason for believing that these words should be read not "as thou comest into Zoar"—which is far away from the land of Egypt—but "when thou enterest Zar." [The Hebrew word *exactly* suits this.] And I want to say a word about that place Zar. It was a most important military point, for it was the place of starting for all the Egyptian expeditions into Syria during the great reigns of the Thothmes and Rameses Pharaohs. They started from "the fortress of Zar;" and there is still to be seen at Karnak that magnificent tableau which represents the triumphal return of Seti I. from one of these expeditions. You can see the "Fortress of Zar," and the Pharaoh in his chariot, at the head of strings of captives who are being taken into bondage in the land of Goshen. The open portals of the fortress are to be seen, and the fortified points of the great military road from Syria; and this is very important, for it is surely connected with a discovery of the late lamented F. W. Holland, Vicar of Evesham. In a letter to me, in May, 1880, he said: "The road which I discovered to the south of that (viz., of Brugsch's route of the Exodus), running due east from Ismaïlia, will, I hope, have had a special interest for you, as the route of Abraham into Egypt. It is a very remarkable road, evidently much used in ancient times, and it is curious that it has remained unknown." Mr. Holland described his route in a paper read before the British Association, and reprinted in the Quarterly Statement of the Palestine Exploration Fund for April, 1879. I hope this most important ancient road will not remain unknown much longer, for it ought to be very carefully surveyed. It is the road by which the fathers came into Egypt; the road at the termination of which, a little within that "Fortress of Zar," Joseph went to meet his father, with all the pomp of Egyptian monarchical grandeur, with his chariots and his escort; the road by which the great armies of Egypt went out upon their wonderful expeditions, which Sir Charles Wilson has referred to, against the Hittites and their other enemies; and therefore I say it is a road well worthy of being thoroughly surveyed. And I cannot help thinking that, since we know approximately the situation of that fortress of Zar, which was the key to the great military inlet to Egypt, by which our own troops so lately led our expedition to Cairo,—I cannot help thinking that if we were to put one thing and another together, we should find ourselves on the eve of very important results. The inlet of this ancient road must needs be closely connected with the great military position in the strong eastern fortified wall of the ancient Pharaohs, the key to Lower Egypt, the Fortress of Zar, hitherto confused by Bible readers with Zoar, in the passage I have quoted. And that discovery of the true Zar of Gen. xiii., which was made by the learned Dr. Haigh, in 1876, is taken for granted by Dr. Dümichen in his important history, now in course of publication. That Zar is a place which should be carefully looked for. Now we will go a little further, about twelve miles along the land of Goshen, along the line of the sweetwater canal, along the exact line of our recent military operations, and to the spot where I think the first engagement took place. We find there, at Tell-el-Maskhuta, the

ruin-heaps and the ancient fortified walls of a most important place—one of the twin store cities which were built by the Israelites for their oppressor, Rameses II. The venerable Lepsius distinguished himself, among many other achievements, by the identification of this place, upon apparently unassailable grounds, with Rameses. It has been taken for granted, and the railway station there is called "Ramsis." M. Naville, in the course of his excavations made there for the Committee of the Egypt Exploration Fund, has found very important monumental evidences. I can give you a short account of his results, but I have not time to argue. I am perfectly aware that Dr. Lepsius still adheres to his original idea that Tel-el-Maskhuta was Rameses, and I have read his recent article in his *Zeitschrift* with the greatest attention. Now M. Naville has found a very great and strong wall of circumvallation of that ancient fortress. It is built of crude bricks, enclosing a restricted area of about twelve acres, but those twelve acres are occupied in a strictly military manner by the magazines of a "store-city." These store-chambers are very interesting indeed. They had high walls, and were strongly built, and they had the peculiarity of being opened only at the top. There were no doorways, and no inlets at the sides, and that peculiarity entirely tallies with the well-known representations of Egyptian granaries and store-chambers given by Wilkinson and Rosellini. While this was a store-city, it was a sanctuary as well, according to the custom of the Egyptians. Like other towns, it had a two-fold name, a religious and a civil name, as, for instance, our own Verulam is called St. Alban's. The secular name of this place was Seku or Sekut, *i.e.*, Succoth, of the Bible. Let me remark that Brugsch has vindicated the sibilant pronunciation of the first Egyptian consonant, the well-known lasso-shaped hieroglyph, in Lepsius's *Zeitschrift*, 1875, p. 8. It is, then, a most interesting fact that the secular name of this place was Succoth. I take this as proved, for it is established by the mention of Seku or Sekut twenty-two times in the inscriptions found there. There are the priests of the well-known setting-sun-god, Tum, of Sekut. And the sanctuary is called, fifteen times over, Pi-tum—the abode of Tum. If anyone should question this, I will gladly give the references by which I think it is clearly established. Thus it was the first halting-place of the Israelites in their exodus. And that is the first nail yet driven hard and fast in their route. We have had many theories and contests, and an agreeable diversity of opinion, but from henceforth I believe that the theory of Brugsch, that Pharaoh's host was swamped by the setting in of the waters of the Mediterranean in the Serbonian marsh, must be given up, and the old theory that the escaping tribes went along the valley of the sweetwater canal, must be regarded as firmly established.

And now we are passing out of the region of vain conjectures into the region of historical realities.

There is another point. Tell-el-Maskhuta is not only the Pithom and the Succoth of the Bible, but a very interesting place, of which we read in the Septuagint version. When Joseph went to meet Jacob, and Judah was sent to meet Joseph on behalf of his father, the meeting-place was Heroöpolis. The identity of the spot is pointed out by Roman inscriptions there, with the name ERO, ERO CASTRA. The derivation of the name given by M. Naville is very interesting, namely, the Egyptian word "Ar," a storehouse, of which the plural is "Aru," identical with the Greek HPOY found on the spot. Thus the name is found, and the road is found, by which Jacob came and Judah went on before him. I may say besides that there is a curious confirmation of the Biblical account of the work of bondage. The walls are very well built. The bricks are of Nile mud, and embedded in mortar, which reminds us that the Egyptians "made the children of Israel to serve

with rigour, and made their lives bitter with hard bondage, in *mortar* and in brick" (Ex. i. 14.) There are three kinds of brick used, the first made with straw properly provided; the next are made with *reed* (the "stubble" of our Bible, and the word used is pure Egyptian, *Kash; arundo, calamus*); and the third kind are made of sheer Nile mud, when even the reeds were exhausted. All these M. Naville has found at Pithom.

I will only add a few words more in following the illustrious Engineer officer, Sir Charles Wilson, whom I am happy to see here in the interest of the Palestine Exploration Fund, and that is, that I am a humble member of the committee of the Egypt Exploration Fund, not by way of rivalry, for I have been a local secretary of the Palestine Fund for many years. The one is the complement of the other. Sir Charles Wilson is himself on the committee of the Egypt Fund. I will therefore only make the shortest possible appeal, and ask, Is it not worth while to pay for pickaxes, to get at the wisdom of the Egyptians?

The Rev. Canon Rawlinson, Exeter College, Oxford.

I must begin with apologising to the meeting for the form of my remarks. I have occasionally been a "selected reader" at a Church Congress, and frequently a voluntary speaker, but never before a "selected speaker." Now, for the first time, finding myself in the list of the "selected speakers," in the innocency of my heart I supposed that a *reader* ought to *read*, and a *speaker* to *speak*. The present custom seems to be different; but for my own part, I have prepared nothing but some rough notes. The audience, therefore, must not expect a finished essay, or elaborate "bursts of prepared eloquence," but must excuse a plain, unvarnished statement. I must also apologise for speaking, as I am about to do, entirely on the subject of the Old Testament, though the bearing of Historical Discovery on Christianity is the point for discussion. But the fact is, in the first place, that no recent historical discovery has touched Christianity directly; what has done so is in the past, and has been made accessible to all by Dean Alford's Greek Testament, and Dean Howson's "Travels of St. Paul;" and secondly, that the two testaments are bound up together, and that any blows struck at the one, pierce through and penetrate the other. This was seen in Germany, in the latter part of the last and the earlier part of the present century, when the pseudo-criticism of Eichhorn, Herder, De Wette, Von Lengerke, Von Bohlen, and others, having demolished (as was boasted) the historical authority of the Old Testament, was followed in strict logical sequence by the attacks of Bauer and Strauss on the authenticity of the New. Mr. Cheyne has told you not to fight the air by the consideration of modes of criticism that are gone by, but to deal with the criticism of the present; and has instanced as "gone by" such things as objections to the fact of Sennacherib's great expedition against Hezekiah, and the general connection of Jewish history with that of Assyria and the East. But how is it that these things, this whole line of objection, is among the "by-gones"—that the mythical theory, as applied to the early Jewish history, is exploded? why, simply, because when even believers were being silenced by the sceptical school, Providence caused the "very stones" to "cry out." Layard and Botta, and others, have disinterred the "stones" of Nineveh and Babylon—and Sir Henry Rawlinson has taken the chief part in deciphering them—and the confirmation of the Bible history from the Assyrian is such that the previous style of criticism has had to be entirely given up. Objections now are of a different kind; they are far

less sweeping. Still they are made ; and the course of discovery is such as frequently to meet them and upset them. By "recent historical discovery," on which I am asked to speak, I propose to understand, "the discoveries of the last five years only"—first, on account of the short time allowed a speaker ; and secondly, because I have treated the earlier discoveries in a paper read before the Congress at Sheffield, in 1878. And even here I cannot attempt to cover the whole ground, but must be content to give two specimens. 1. Among favourite objections made to the inspiration of the Hebrew Prophets is the following :—That their prophecies are often unfulfilled ; and from this it is argued that where the result corresponds with the prediction, we are to attribute the fact to their possession of mere ordinary human foresight. A crucial intance is said to be furnished by the prophecies of a great expedition into Egypt by Nebuchadnezzar, late in his reign, in which he plundered and destroyed the whole land from Migdol to Syene, on the borders of Ethiopia. Profane history formerly knew nothing of this—no monument touched on it. Josephus alone spoke of a second expedition, but he placed it at a time contradicted by the Egyptian annals, and clearly was merely bent on bolstering up the authority of his sacred books. This is what has many times been said ; but it can be said no longer. Two documents can now be produced in which the expedition is noticed. One—Egyptian—is an inscription of Nes-Hor, long known, but only of late correctly rendered by Dr. Wiedemann, who has shown that it speaks of a great invasion of Egypt by Asiatics, in the reign of Apries (the Pharaoh-Hophra of Scripture), in which the temples were destroyed, and the whole country ravaged from the Delta to Elephantine, on the Ethiopian border. Nebuchadnezzar's name is not mentioned ; but no one will pretend that there is any other Asiatic monarch of the time strong enough to have conducted so great an expedition, with such success, so far. The other document—Babylonian—is an inscription of Nebuchadnezzar himself, read by Mr. Pinches, of the British Museum, in 1878. This contains the fact of the expedition into Egypt, the name of Nebuchadnezzar, and the exact year in which the expedition was made, Nebuchadnezzar's thirty-sixth year, or B.C. 568. It represents his adversary as (probably) Amasis, the successor of Apries (Pharaoh-Hophra), which may seem to be a difficulty, since the Egyptian document mentioned Apries ; but the year of the expedition exactly falls into the space when Apries and Amasis were both kings together, and inhabited together the same palace, at Sais, as Herodotus tells us in his second book. 2. My other "specimen" concerns the Book of Daniel and Belshazzar. Now in the old times of historical pseudo-criticism there was no objection which was more frequently urged to the Book of Daniel—always a favourite object of attack to sceptics, perhaps from its containing the remarkable prophecy of the "seventy weeks unto Messiah the Prince"—than the occurrence in it of the name of Belshazzar as that of the last Babylonian king before Cyrus. Profane writers give the name of the last king as Nabonidus, or Labynetus ; they say he was captured by Cyrus, whereas Belshazzar was slain ; they say he was no relation to Nebuchadnezzar, whereas Belshazzar is called Nebuchadnezzar's son. Well, in 1854, an inscription was sent from Babylonia to the British Museum, and deciphered by Sir Henry Rawlinson, and upon it he found the statement that Nabonidus had a son—his eldest son he calls him—named Bel-shar-uzzur, or Belshazzar. The mention was in such a form as convinced Sir Henry that Nabonidus had associated Belshazzar with him on the throne ; and he at once announced the discovery. But the sceptics were not satisfied. Mr. Fox Talbot, in the "Records of the Past," so late as 1875, called the discovery in question—stated that association was in no way indicated ; that Belshazzar might have been "a mere child" when the inscription was made ; that there was no evidence of his having ever reigned, and that the whole explanation and

attempted reconciliation of the Book of Daniel with profane history was illusive. In 1880, however, a fresh document was exhumed at Babylon—a tablet of Cyrus—which was deciphered by Mr. Pinches. This document shows that practically the real king of Babylon at the time of the attack of Cyrus was not Nabonidus, but "the king's son," who is mentioned at least six times, who was at the head of the army, and conducted the defence. He could certainly not then have been "a mere child." Whether he had the title of king or not does not appear, but a dated tablet is thought to have been found issued in his "third year." The tablet of Cyrus confirms the profane historians who state that Nabonidus fell into Cyrus' hands alive, and that he had no part in the final struggle at Babylon itself. It gives that struggle with great brevity, but speaks of the strong quarter of the town, where were the chief temples and the royal palace, being seized by rebels, who seem to have defended it for four months. No distinct mention of "the king's son" as conducting the defence is made; but I think it is a reasonable conclusion for a sound historical critic to draw from the authorities, sacred and profane, taken together, that it was in the quarter of Babylon mentioned, at the end of the four months, that the handwriting appeared upon the palace wall after the great feast, and that Belshazzar—the son of Nabonidus, and the "king's son" of the Cyrus tablet—was slain.

DISCUSSION.

The Very Rev. J. S. Howson, D.D., Dean of Chester.

I ask leave to allude for a few moments to a sentence which fell from Professor Sanday. He said enough, I think, to show that he himself attached importance to that sentence, although he did not dwell upon it at length. I refer to the statement that the most destructive critics of our time agree in accepting the four great epistles of St. Paul—those that were written to the Romans, Corinthians, and Galatians—as undoubtedly written by that Apostle. Professor Sanday alluded to one recent exception, in the case of a Dutch theologian of recent years; but I think he disposed of that exception in such a manner that we may treat it as non-existent. I accept the concession as put forward by M. Renan, and take it as my starting point. I desire to speak with respect of M. Renan. I believe him to be a sincere man. His erudition is very great, and his style is charming. But I think his logic is defective. His statement on this point is as follows:—That even the most destructive critics of Germany, even Baur, whom he names, agree in admitting that these four epistles were undoubtedly written by St. Paul. Now, accepting this concession, and advancing from it, let us see to what it leads us. In the first place, if these four Epistles are accepted as St. Paul's—all the rest of the New Testament being regarded as merely extant documents without any authority—in these four Epistles we have Christianity, and Christianity consists of facts, of doctrines, and of institutions. We have here the facts of Christianity, even some of the minutest facts, as, for instance, that Christ was born of the house of David. But, to take only the facts of the crucifixion and the resurrection, whatever questions of difficulty the unbeliever has to face, in connection with especially the latter subject, he must face in dealing with these four Epistles. As to the doctrines of Christianity, I will simply refer to two which are prominently characteristic of our holy religion. I mean the doctrines which are connected with, and which may be grouped together under, the word "redemption," and next the remarkable place assigned in our religion to the exercise of "faith." It happens that in these Epistles, especially in two of them, we have in the most explicit form a full exposition of these very doctrines. And now, to pass on to institutions, it is somewhat remarkable that here it is that we have the only Apostolic teaching in regard to the Eucharist, whilst references to Holy Baptism are frequent throughout. It would be difficult to exaggerate the close and intimate connection established between these Epistles and the Gospels

by the mere fact of such allusions to these institutions. I say, then, that we here have before us in these Epistles Christianity; and whatever difficulties are felt by the unbeliever in his conflict with Christianity, those same difficulties are found here. And I would add two remarks upon this part of our subject; one remark is this, that the manner in which Christianity is set before us in these four Epistles requires some kind of evangelical background to give it intelligible meaning. This evangelical background we have supplied to us in the Gospels. Thus what we find in these four Epistles predisposes us to accept the Gospels as authentic. Another remark which may be allowed is this, that, having in these four Epistles Christianity, we have something which gives us confidence in God; and, believing that God would not deceive us, we are prepared to look to the other parts of the New Testament with that kind of faith which disposes us to accept them as parts of the Divine revelation. Now I pass to another point in these four Epistles. We have there the personality of St. Paul, and this personality is not a commonplace personality. St. Paul's character, St. Paul's experience, St. Paul's account of himself, are subjects extremely difficult to deal with by the unbeliever; and these difficulties we must face in those four Epistles. We have, for instance, the assertion of his preternatural call by this Apostle. With regard to this preternatural call, which he asserts most strongly, using this as his starting point, either we must suppose that he does not state the truth, or we must suppose that he was misled by a delusion or a dream. It is not only difficult to suppose that a dream could have produced the results which were produced by the actual work of St. Paul? But, again, we have also his character before us. Take one point—his extraordinary versatility, his rapid passing from one emotion to another, which were in sympathy with the vehement logical characteristic of the man. This we find in these Epistles, and this we find also in his other Epistles, and in the Acts of the Apostles. Here, again, is a link of logical coherence. Once more let us note the wonderful devotion of St. Paul to Christ, as indicated in these four documents. How are we to explain this devotion? Christ is the greatest difficulty to the unbeliever, St. Paul is perhaps the next greatest difficulty. Each is a wonder. But the wonder is infinitely increased when we consider the combination of the two in this devotion of St. Paul to Christ. Well, this is only a very slight fragment of that great subject of Christian evidence which is under our attention this evening; but it has its value, and I think it may be recommended to this audience for further consideration. My point is this, that if we accept these four Epistles, we must logically accept more. Holding them firmly in our hands, we not only have them, but we can from this point pass on, link by link, until we grasp the whole chain of the New Testament, or, to adopt another image, through these Epistles we become conscious that we are travelling along a road from which paths diverge to the Gospels on one side, and the other Epistles and the Acts on the other side. This is, as I have said, only a small fragment of evidence; but it has this advantage, that whether it is conclusive or not, it puts the other evidential argument in jeopardy. If one might compare our holy religion to a great cathedral, with the light of heaven resting upon its pinnacles, and its foundations deeply laid by God, this is only a very subordinate buttress, but it interferes with some of the other great supports. All the main buttresses, even without this, remain as they were before.

The Rev. ALEXANDER HATCHARD, Curate of St. James's Church, Curtain Road, E.C.

My only right to stand upon this platform to-night, is that during the past four years I have met nearly all the leading infidels in England, in public debate in one form or another, in London. In this way I have come into contact with the objections which they urge against the Scriptures and Biblical truth. I would remind you that every day of the week, and every day of the year, from one year's end to another, there is an infidel *propaganda* at work in our midst. That by means of tracts and pamphlets and books, as well as newspapers, the greatest untruths, and, if I may say so before the Bishop of Oxford, lies, are being constantly circulated about the Bible. The persons who do this are utterly without any regard as to the

exact facts of the case with respect to the truth of the Old and New Testaments. They are simply reckless of any historical confirmations which the Scriptures have had in recent times. I need not name these persons, because they are sufficiently well known to the country. They are led on by one who would be an M.P., or who is an M.P. in a certain sense. He and his associates are constantly spreading their evil teaching about the Scriptures. This they do in a form which is calculated to attract the attention of the great working classes of this country. I have the best of reasons for knowing that this is so from my position as a parish clergyman in the East of London. Large numbers of the working class throughout the country are led astray by these publications, which they have not enough knowledge of the subject to value at their true worth. Under the authority of the Bishop of London, I have met many of the leaders of so-called freethought in public debate. Now a word or two as to the opinions which these men try to promulgate. Canon Rawlinson has told you that the book of Daniel has been very much disputed by freethinkers of late years. That is so. Perhaps the reason is that Daniel speaks so clearly about the Messiah. If Canon Rawlinson can show that Daniel is a trustworthy book, in a word, is historical, he has done a good work. For twenty-five years I have been a follower of Canon Rawlinson, and I know that his works have been of the greatest use in helping the public to see the historical truth of the Scriptures. Certainly it has been so with me. The confirmations of the Scriptures which have come from Assyria and Egypt in recent times are very valuable in promoting faith in the Bible. The same may be said of the work of the Palestine Exploration Fund in the Holy Land, and of the work of the Egyptian Exploration Fund which has very recently been established. Time would fail me to tell you of what has been done by the workers in these departments of discovery. Sir Charles Wilson has already told you of the great work which has been accomplished in Palestine by true friends of the Bible. As has been well said, the best hand-book of Palestine is the Bible. There is a wonderful truth to nature on the part of the writers of the Old and New Testaments which modern discoveries have well-established. But let me glance at the subject which has been brought before you by Professor Sanday. The work which he and such men as Professor Westcott and Bishop Lightfoot, of Durham, have done has been of the greatest service in establishing faith in the historical character of the Gospel history. For the labours of Bishop Lightfoot I have the most profound regard. He has really been of the highest use in overthrowing the sceptical positions. The great thing which the freethinking party have tried to establish for some years past has been that Christianity came into being some time in the second or third centuries. In fact that it was an accumulation of legends. The point for us to consider is, "By whom were the Gospels written, and when?" Now if Professor Sanday can establish the fact of the Gospels having been written before the close of the year 100 A.D., or rather before the year 70 A.D., that is before the destruction of Jerusalem, much good has been performed. Because if the Gospels attributed to Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John can be shown upon good grounds to have been really the work of their hands, the Christian point is almost gained. The question naturally arises how the books came to be written and circulated if their contents are not true. I wish therefore to speak in the highest terms of the book which Professor Sanday published two or three years ago, called, I think, "The Gospels in the Second Century." The one thing to which all the work of such scholars as those whom I have named (and a few others of a like character) is tending is, "Can we accept the Gospels as a truthful history." And here comes in the point which has been urged upon you by the Dean of Chester. To this also I wish to give the utmost importance. It is the well-known fact of the sceptical school allowing the Pauline authorship of the Epistles to the Romans, 1 and 2 Corinthians, and the Galatians. These are called the *great* Epistles of St. Paul. From my knowledge of Germany, I know that these epistles are acknowledged by all but the most out and out freethinkers. Even Jews admit them. I quite agree with what the Dean of Chester has said here to-night upon the subject. I have found that the boldest infidels had no answer to give to this argument. Because the real truth is that the great facts of the Gospel history are contained in these great epistles of St. Paul. That he held the facts of the Gospel history to be really true is most manifest. That he regarded Jesus of Nazareth as a Divine person is beyond a doubt. St. Paul was a Jew, and as such he would have strictly avoided giving Divine honours to a mere man. All that is really distinctive of Jesus above other great teachers seems to have been held by St. Paul in these four Epistles. I might almost say that it is so in the First Epistle to the Corinthians. The great importance of this argument cannot be overrated. But to bring the lessons of these great

topics home to the masses of the people is one of the most pressing matters in the Church at the present time. But sermons, popular lectures, and cheap literature, would do very much to teach the masses the force of the lessons to be learned. If this were done, the blatant infidels who roam about the country to-day would not be able to lead astray the working classes of England by their gross mis-statements, and falsehoods, about Biblical truth. The people would see that the Bible is a record of Divine Truth!

The Rev. R. B. GIRDLESTONE, Hon. Canon of Christ Church, and Principal of Wycliffe Hall, Oxford.

I THINK I may venture to congratulate you on the fact that the discussion this evening has followed so closely on the discussion in the afternoon; for I think there may have been some obscurity resting in many minds as to what to believe concerning the great facts contained in the first chapter of Genesis. But any clouds which might have rested on those minds this afternoon must have been cleared away this evening, and last, but not least, by the last speaker. I think you have had almost every good side of Biblical criticism and investigation brought before you in such a manner as to convince you that the Bible stands as firmly founded upon truth as ever, and that no power of man has shaken it down, or can do so. I think a great many are perplexed at this time as to how to read, how to understand, and how to teach certain parts of the Bible; and they need some help from men in authority as to how to do so. For example, concerning the Creation, the Deluge, the Exodus, and the Miracles recorded in Joshua and other parts of the Old Testament. Now, the Biblical critics of Germany and other countries, and especially Holland, have not always lent the help which we desire to have at their hands. They have pulled down that which we want them to build up. We look in vain for a reconstruction of the Bible. We hear that one Book is to be parcelled out among many hands, and that another Book was not written within 100 years of the time when it was supposed to have been written. We would like these critics to put forward a Bible in the order in which they conceive it to have been written, with the dates of each part, and we should like the modern critics to agree in giving us an idea of the Creation if they can, and then we should have something to deal with. It is all very well for a man to say that Leviticus was not written by Moses, but the book bears its authority upon its own face. See, for example, the last verses of the 26th and 27th chapters of Leviticus. It may be added that almost every part of the Pentateuch bears upon its face the date of its origin. This has to be dealt with. It is the same with regard to the prophetic books. They have what may be called headings, which contain, not only the name of the writer, but some indication as to the position he occupied in society, and as to the time during which he prophesied. You will find it the same if you examine the special prophecies bearing upon important events. They are dated. Thus the prophecies of Daniel were always ushered in with some such words as these: "In the first year of Cyrus." I ask the critic, If you are going to do away with these dates, on what ground will you do so? It will not be upon any ground of history, whether of the Hebrews or of the Chaldeans, but really on the ground that man does not like to believe in a Supernatural God. I think some men's idea of God is very much like the old heathen idea, "He has eyes and sees not, and ears but hears not, a mouth has he but does not speak." What would you think of a living God who cannot speak to man, or who could not communicate with man in such a manner as he could understand. You and I can communicate with men on the other side of the world in a few minutes, and cannot God, who gives us the power to do so, do something of the same sort Himself? If the first part of Genesis is true that man is made in the image of God, we have a solution of almost all the difficulties before us. The very questions which agitate our minds concerning evolution resolve themselves into this: Has God a will? and has He power to exercise that will? and if so, are the changes in creation, as also the design of creation, due to Him? or have we imported these ideas into nature out of our own minds? and if so, whence come our mental powers? Settle it in your minds that God sees and plans and designs. There is design

throughout the Bible. It is not the design of the writers of the Bible, but the design of Him from whom all the writers draw their forces, whether we call that force intuition or inspiration. Call it what you will, there is the hand of God. Surely God is in this place whether we know it or whether we know it not. As a student of the Bible from my boyhood, and having had many anxious doubts and difficulties concerning it, I would say, study it critically and continuously, comparing book with book, chapter with chapter, search into the meaning of the Hebrew words, and examine carefully the technical usage of theological words, the sacrificial words, and the topographical words. Follow out the history by the aid of a map, and if you do that the events recorded will rise before you as realities. The whole Bible is a picture. The language of the Hebrews is the most pictorial of any. This is true too of it in its theological aspect. Take the first chapter of Leviticus and see the picture presented to the Israelite mind by the technical words used, and you will see something which you will thank God for. You will find how the idea of acceptance entered into the soul. So it is of all the great truths in the Bible. The more you study its words the more you see the hand of God adapting the words to the human mind, as He has adapted the light of heaven to the human eye. I would say this in conclusion, the working men of the country, I think, as a body, would be thankful to stick to the Bible and to know about Christ, and I think that in dealing with the Old Testament you must always take Christ as your starting point. The Dean of Chester has told you how facts concerning the Epistles imply the Gospels; and so Christ implies the Old Testament. If critics puzzle you, say to them, "I do not know all about the origin, and the dates, and the authors of certain books, but one thing I do know, I know that the Old Testament as I have it, is substantially—nay, I had almost said, exactly, the Old Testament as Christ had it; and that being the case, my course is clear. I have put my faith in Christ, I have accepted Him as my Master in all respects, and I will do with the Old Testament what He did with it, He spoke of it as 'the Scriptures' which 'cannot be broken,' and upon that ground I will stand."

The Rev. CUNNINGHAM GEIKIE, D.D., Vicar of St. Mary, Barnstaple.

I WISH to say a word respecting the criticism of the Old Testament, in case anyone may think that the grand old book is more shattered than they could have supposed. As to the division of the earlier portions, forming what is known as the Mosaic narrative, there is no agreement among the new critics as to the sections to be assigned to different times or authors. On the contrary, if you examine the most recent works on the subject—the "Introduction," for example, of De Weth, edited by Schrader, and that of Bleek, edited by Wellhausen—you will find that they differ radically as to their views on this point. It matters not, indeed, what critic one names, each has his own theory, which runs counter, more or less, to that of all others. But when there is so much uncertainty among those who sit in judgment on these venerable documents, and when that which is pronounced of late origin by one is maintained by others to be the work of an early age, old-fashioned people may be excused for waiting till doctors come nearer an agreement. The question of the date of the Levitical ritual—whether Mosaic, or introduced only after the return from exile—is being fiercely waged in Germany, nor has England itself escaped the controversy. But if I may venture to name a book to my learned brethren, there is one recently published—Bredenkamp's "*Gesetz und Propheten*"—which seems to me to establish the existence of that ritual from the earliest times. Indeed, it must not be forgotten that in antiquity religion and ritual were the complement of each other, or rather that ritual constituted in public opinion the essence of worship. If the priest exactly obeyed the prescribed forms of a particular act of worship, and there were no deviation from the set rules on the part of the worshipper, the conditions of acceptance and favourable answer had been fulfilled, and the result desired was assumed as necessarily secured. No freedom of action in approaching the Deity

was imagined possible; every detail must be formal, to the minutest particular. No religion, therefore, could exist without a fixed and copious ceremonial, and it is therefore impossible to conceive of Israel having had a religion at even the earliest period of its history, if this were wanting. But if this be so, what other ritual than the Levitical was in existence? The late origin of Deuteronomy has been taken for granted by many critics; but there is one argument, found in a book, now, I believe, out of print—König's "*Alt testamentliche Studien*"—which, to my mind, demands great hesitation before we accept this modern opinion. It is there shown, by an exhaustive examination of the text, that Deuteronomy is marked beyond all other portions of the Pentateuch by the number of Archaic words found in it. No test, I submit, of the age of a document could be more trustworthy. The occurrence in any writing of forms of speech which were obsolete at a certain date, or are not found in compositions later than that date, necessarily fixes the origin of the composition as earlier. In our own English Bible, even were the date of its appearance otherwise unknown, there are words which would of themselves settle its translation as the work of a particular age. And so, König shows, it is with Deuteronomy. Nor must it be forgotten, in reference to the general question of the age of the Pentateuch as a whole, that if some scholars, varying greatly among themselves, claim a late origin for it, there are others who as stoutly take opposite views. Such a great authority as Dillmann, for example, vigorously opposed the latest supporter of the new school—Smend—and Professor Fried Delitzsch is known in every land as taking the same Conservative side. Indeed, it appears as if the very license of the destructive critics would soon lead to a wide reaction. Men like Kneven, Wellhausen, Stade, and their British representative, Robertson Smith, have pushed their conclusions to such unwarrantable lengths that the very extravagance of this assumption is already acting as its own antidote. I have often thought that the whole dispute was much like that of the last century respecting the authorship of the great poems attributed to Homer. At one time it was unscientific and unscholarly to say a word for their being substantially the creation of one great intellect; but now-a-days the world has come back to its old belief, and the blind poet of Chios is left to enjoy the glory of his matchless epics. So I believe it will be, to a large extent, in reference to the Old Testament. A strong and vigorous thinker rises now and then, who starts a new theory in Biblical criticism, and the crowd of inferior minds follow in his wake as boats are drawn after a great ship. But in the end another thinker rises, to restore views for the time discarded, and in his turn it becomes the fashion to take the word at his lips. Criticism may and must modify opinions in some particulars, but no one need be alarmed by any fear that it will take from us our Bible.

The Rev. V. H. STANTON, Fellow, and Senior Dean of Trinity College, Cambridge.

My only reason for rising to speak is, that in the course of the debate this evening, considerable stress has been laid upon the argument from the four Epistles of St. Paul, which are acknowledged even by sceptical writers; and great pre-eminence has been given to that argument among Christian apologists at the present time. In order that this argument, as it has been stated, may be used with full force and effect, it needs some supplementing. An answer to this argument as put by modern critics, would be that St. Paul simply represents his own view of Christianity—the view of Christianity which he had himself developed; and that we must distinguish from this the original Christianity of the Jewish Christians, which was afterwards represented by the Ebionites. Therefore, I think we want to carry this argument a step further, and these four Epistles of St. Paul will themselves possibly supply one point. In the Epistle to the Galatians especially, St. Paul is carrying on a very vehement polemic against Jewish teachers, but in that polemic he assumes throughout that their Christology is the same as his own. They differ from him with regard to the observance of the law, but all through it is only on the significance of the death of Christ upon which he insists, and not on the doctrine of the Person of Christ. No doubt that difference of view as to the significance of the death of Christ did imply a want of hold upon the fundamental faith in Christ

Himself; but it is plain from the polemic which he is conducting, that he would have alluded to any formulated error in their view of Christ himself, if such had existed. Up to that time, then, in the Church, differences had not manifested themselves on this head.

But there is also another document to which no allusion has been made, and which modern criticism concedes to us. The Apocalypse of St. John is admitted to be by St. John, and is used to supply evidence of the supposed opposition between the elder Apostles and St. Paul. Whether it does prove this, I do not now inquire. If it does, this makes all the more remarkable the rest of its testimony. We can prove most clearly from it a position for our Lord Jesus Christ, which virtually implies His co-equal divinity. It is important in order to complete an argument, that we should add these links to it. Let me add that it was with great satisfaction that I listened, as others, I am sure, must have done, to the masterly paper on New Testament Criticism, by Professor Sanday. It seems to me peculiarly comforting, when we are, as at present, thrown into so much difficulty and doubt as to many questions connected with the Old Testament, that we should be finding our feet so firmly with regard to the New. Christian students are here beginning to feel how strong their position is. We may, then, learn the great lesson of patience and confidence with regard to the Old Testament, and also with regard to all scientific questions. It seems to me that we have to learn—and I am thankful for the way this lesson has been insisted upon by many speakers, both this afternoon and this evening—we have to learn to wait and see what may be the result of genuine scientific investigation and historical criticism; and we ought not to fear the result, but willingly to accept whatever truth teaches. We must not be in too much of a hurry to make up our minds upon many of those questions of science; and, having a firm hold upon the great outlines of the Christian faith, which we can prove historically,—with great satisfaction, I believe, at least to those who have not made up their minds not to admit the Supernatural—sure, then, of what is most essential, we can confidently wait whatever may be said as to these other questions.

TOWN HALL,

TUESDAY EVENING, OCTOBER 2ND.

The Ven. ARCHDEACON POTT in the Chair.

LAYMEN'S PRACTICAL WORK.

PAPER.

The Rev. H. T. ARMFIELD, M.A., F.S.A., Rector of Colne Engaine, Essex.

THE movement which is before us to-day is one of the replies which the modern Church is making to the new demands which are forced upon us at the present day. The larger employment of the laity in the practical work of the Church is, in fact, one of the newest expedients which the pressure of the times has developed for enlarging the ministrations of the Church, both in quantity and in kind.

There is, perhaps, some risk of the true significance of the movement being misunderstood. It would be a disastrous confession of failure in the Church's mission if we were to send it forth to the world that population is outgrowing her capacity, and that because clergy were not to be had in like proportion she is driven to fall back upon the assistance of the laity. Happily we have at present no such contingency to face. The growth of the population, indeed, is colossal. It is, perhaps, not known to many that the population of this country is increasing at the rate of some three millions every ten years, *i.e.*, that there is an addition of 300,000 people every year. It is clear that in order to hold her ground the Church must make a yearly addition to her ministrations in one form or another. At one time there seemed some reason to fear that, whilst the population was rapidly increasing, there were influences at work which would make the number of clergymen actually less than it had been in the past. At the present moment there is no reason to fear such a catastrophe as that. To take the latest example; in the year 1882 we had 819 men admitted to Holy Orders. Of these it is estimated that 460 are required to fill death vacancies, so that we have a net increment of 359 clergymen to meet the year's increment of 300,000 in population. This plainly gives something better than one clergyman to every new thousand of population, which is quite as good as the state of things in the past, and probably a trifle better. In this respect, then, the modern Church has not failed.

The Church of our time has not failed, in the sense that it has at its disposal a machinery relatively as large as it ever had, and is doing proportionally a work at least as great as it ever did. What, however, we want is to do very much more. We are not so dazzled by the unquestionable triumphs of Church progress as not to see one melancholy

fact that has emerged. It is unhappily notorious that the ministrations of the Church, organised as they have been in the past, have entirely failed to touch vast multitudes of the people. In some degree that is, no doubt, due to causes that are beyond human control; but, in so far as they lie in our power, we desire to correct them. It seems possible to hope that by calling out into active service the great volunteer army of religious laymen, there may be successes in store of which churchmen have never dared to dream before; that the pulses of the Church's heart might be felt in circles where they have never been felt before, and that amongst these alienated masses a sympathy with us might at last awake which the exertions of the clergy, too often suspected as professional, have entirely failed to stir. Such a hope is possible; for if the masses have drifted away from the Church into alienation or indifference, it is not, we know, from any inherent weakness in the Church's cause itself; it is not even, in many cases, from any substantial difference of conviction with ourselves; but it is because the ministrations of the Church have not been multiplied enough, and perhaps not diversified enough, to force upon all minds the conviction, which we hold ourselves, that there is absolutely nothing that is requisite for a soul's health which the English Church cannot supply.

There is one other consideration which would incline us to use the services of the laity much more freely than we have done in time past. It hardly admits of doubt that many people have been lost to the Church because she seemed to provide so little outlet for the exercise of those gifts and powers which are not unfrequently to be found in the Christian laity. There are persons who have slipped away from us, not from any vital difference of religious opinion, but because (as they have felt) they *must* speak for God; and as we have presented no channel for their utterance, they have felt constrained to make one for themselves. There is many a layman of that mould who might have been retained with us by the movement that is before us, and who would have done the Church admirable service under a proper rule. His fitness would be tested; his nomination would issue from the clergyman of his parish; his functions would reach to the holding of services and classes, and would be defined by the license of the bishop.

The most difficult question on the practical side of the subject would be to settle the precise limits within which such lay agency might be permitted to act. That there are some religious acts which the Church could never concede to laymen would be admitted on all hands. But on the other hand, no modern churchman would be likely to feel any difficulty about a layman's holding a religious service, say, in a schoolroom, or in some private apartment. No objection would be offered, if at such a service he used exclusively some of the Church's authorised prayers, and if he finished with an instruction or discourse, which would be, to all intents and purposes, preaching a sermon. But if so, how shall we deny him the privilege of using some portion of the Church Service itself for such a purpose. And as the next step of the induction, is the layman of the future to be empowered to hold the public service of the Church on what are substantially equal terms with the clergy? Where are we going to draw the line? It is not altogether hopeless to frame a practical working answer to the question. The practical solution might probably be found in some rule of this kind—that while the

layman would undoubtedly have to hold services of some kind or other in private houses; while he would probably be admitted, as indeed he is admitted now, to a certain share in the public services, even in the Church itself, yet that he be not authorised to conduct any part of the public service without the assistance and co-operation of the clergyman. His character in school should be uniformly that of an assistant, and never that of what we might call the independent organ of public worship.

The question of the ecclesiastical status of the men who are thus to be enlisted in the Church's work, is one upon which there is a considerable difference of opinion. It has been sometimes thought that the aid of such men would be rendered still more effective if, without leaving their secular calling, they were admitted to Deacon's Orders. That opinion has been entertained by men of such eminence in the Church, of such weight in counsel, and of such proved sagacity in the conduct of affairs, that it necessarily commands respectful consideration, even from those who do not themselves share it. It may be well to notice the precise phrase in which the proposal is made. It is described as the revival of a permanent Diaconate, and it means that the class of men who are now helping as laymen, may, if they will, be admitted as deacons, without any intention of proceeding to the higher orders of the ministry. Such men, it will be observed, would be no longer laymen, but clerics; yet, as at present, they are to be at liberty to continue in their worldly calling. Now, we do not want to break altogether with our past. We are not so panic-stricken by the distresses of our times, as altogether to forget the usages of Christendom that have gone before us. Indeed, an appeal to antiquity and precedent is properly made on behalf of this proposal, when it is described as a "Revival"—a recovery, that is, of something which once existed, but which we have lost. It is, however, questionable whether the facts, when they are duly examined, will really bear the weight of that appeal. It is, indeed, true that in the past history of the Church, we can find examples, not only of deacons, but even of bishops, maintaining themselves, and relieving others by following their worldly craft. But these cases, it should be noticed, always carry the impress of one common mark. They always present themselves in the character of local concessions to extreme poverty or some other emergency; and it is open to question whether the liberties tacitly conceded to some poor struggling church in the East, can, either in point of logic or in honour, be cited as precedents to be normally followed by us, who form at this moment the wealthiest Church in Christendom.

But there is also a flaw in divinity lurking in this proposal. One of its features consists in the point of these men always remaining deacons, and having no intention, either secret or avowed, of qualifying themselves for Priest's Orders. In that sense of the words, I must confess that I have been unable to discover any part of the Orthodox Church in which the Diaconate ever was regarded as a "Permanent" Order. In our own branch of the Church it could not take place without an alteration of the Prayer Book. Over all newly-ordained Deacons, the prayer is made that they "may so well behave themselves in this inferior office, that they may be found worthy to be called unto the higher ministries in Thy Church;" and, in making that prayer, the English

Church is perfectly in harmony with the usage of the Church in other parts of the world. I have searched through the ancient Ordination Services of Churches speaking many different tongues, but I cannot find one single specimen which does not expressly contemplate the deacon's qualifying himself for promotion in the ministry.* The striking uniformity of the practice is, no doubt, traceable to a Scriptural origin, which is found in the Apostle's phrase, "they that have used the Office of a Deacon well, purchase to themselves a good degree." The language of our Prayer Book then is Scriptural in its rise; it is universal in its adoption; and to abrogate it, would be to throw the English Church out of harmony in this respect with all Catholic practice.

On a lower ground than this, we could not make our lay-helpers into deacons on the terms proposed, without first getting the 76th Canon rescinded, which provides that "no man being admitted a deacon..... shall afterward use himself in the course of his life as a layman." And in the exercise of his worldly calling, we should have to protect him from penalties by the repeal of the Act of Parliament,† which at present makes it against the law for any one in Holy Orders to engage in trade, traffic, or merchandise. If we pass then from the field of opinion and theory, to the field of practical politics, the scheme for transforming a large number of our lay-helpers into deacons, demands no less than an Act of Parliament, the repeal of a Canon, and the revision of the Prayer-Book: a demand which materially affects its value as a practical measure for supplementing the existing ministrations of the Church.

For the present, however, the character of this movement is that it enlists the services of men who are emphatically laymen. Probably one side of their influence would be gone, if they in any sense ceased to be known as laymen. The novelty, indeed, lies not in the employment of an agency which is exclusively lay; for in many a parish the assistance of a layman has been already used under the name of a "Scripture reader." The novelty, therefore, is not there; but it lies in the stamp and class of layman that is now being attracted to work directly for the Church. There is quite evidence enough to show that many of these laymen belong to a very different class of society to that from which the paid Scripture reader has hitherto been drawn. It is, no doubt, the volunteer element that has drawn gentlemen of dignified social rank into the active service of the Church. Some idea of that side of the question may be gathered from the lists of the lay-workers in the diocese of London. I find here the son of a peer of the realm; two or three general officers; a Knight of the Bath; an executive officer in the Royal Navy; an eminent London publisher; a well-known editor; and many others whose names and addresses are indicative of a certain social consideration. It is not, of course, to be supposed, nor, indeed, is it to be desired, that all the lay-workers of the Church should be drawn from the upper classes of society; but a movement which shows a tendency to draw into active service the men of an easy independent position, who have often been content to be little more than lookers-on

* The Syrian Nestorian and the Syrian Eutychian Churches seem to be an exception. But probably the passage from Timothy was read even then. *See* Martene.

† 1 and 2 Vic. c. 106, 28-30.

at our work—such a movement has, so far, a claim for consideration at the hands of the churchmen of our day.

At the same time, there is a danger about which a word ought to to be said. The movement for lay readers is received with by no means unanimous approval. One of the bishops has elsewhere spoken of it as likely to run into self-will, and to eventuate in schism. The contingencies which underlie such a judgment as that are probably less likely to arise in London and the larger cities than in smaller circles, where a layman ministers in the parish of which he is himself a resident. It would not indeed be always possible to get the layman who is both suited and inclined for the work; but having got him the question sometimes might arise, How are you to get rid of him? Taking human nature as it is, we cannot ignore the possibility of the ministrations of the layman becoming popular, even disastrously popular. What is likely to happen if it should be whispered that the ministrations of the layman are more effective than those of the clergyman? that the layman proves, in fact, to be the better preacher of the two? No doubt the good sense and the right feeling of all the parties concerned would, in most cases, lift them above the atmosphere in which alone such considerations can live. But there are probably cases, within the experience of most of us, where the relations between men who ought to have been cordial fellow-workers have become sadly strained and ultimately broken by the inroad of these vulgar infirmities. At first sight it might seem enough to reply that the same difficulty might arise when those who are associated together to work a parish are all clergymen. There is, however, one momentous point of difference. One of the two clergymen can go elsewhere. The layman in many cases could not. His home, his business, his fortune, his ancestry, his associations and ties of a thousand kinds fetter him inseparably to the spot. True, his license might be revoked; but it is not difficult to imagine that the clergyman of a parish might find himself in an uncomfortable position, and might possibly find the roots of future mischief in his parish deeply struck, with his lay reader still upon the spot, and still eager for the work, but reduced to a state of unwelcome, though perhaps not wholly unmerited, disfranchisement.

In short, the movement which we have been considering, seems to share the fate which is inseparable from every fresh departure. There are risks; there are perplexities of detail; but when the most has been made of them, it may fairly be doubted whether all of them together ought to deter us from welcoming an agency which in its healthier forms seems charged with an ascertained wealth of power for advancing the progress of the Church.

ADDRESSES.

G. A. Spottiswoode, Esq., Chairman of the Lay Helpers' Diocesan Association.

I wish to confine myself strictly to the practical work of laymen, and not to touch upon those far-reaching considerations into which the subject often leads us. I consider that a good deal may be done by laymen in clearing away the superfluous

labours which are sometimes entered into. I would ask, whether in many city parishes, and in many country parishes, too, a great deal of time is not wasted in superfluous committees? For practical purposes, I would suggest that this kind of work should be cleared away, and that laymen should go directly into the real work they have in hand. I remember a long time ago a clergyman speaking to a friend about the advantages which would be gained if rich people would become sponsors for the poor. "A capital thing," said the friend, "let's make a society and have a committee at once." That was the way of not doing it. If the man had undertaken to act upon the suggestion himself, that would have been a practical way of doing it. Another incumbrance in the way of practical working is the over-lapping of so many societies. For example, there are two very excellent societies, one of them young, the other old, which, if they ever come to do very much work, must tread on one another's toes. I refer to the Church of England Young Men's Society, and the Young Men's Friendly Society, and I think that something might be done to prevent two such societies as these going over the same ground. The first thing, I suppose, that would suggest itself to anybody in taking into consideration the subject of lay work, would be Sunday school teaching, and yet we do not know where to get our Sunday school teachers. Perhaps I may be allowed to say that a somewhat truer expression would be that we do not know how to get them. Too often, in pleading for more teachers, people say, "Oh, Mr. So-and-so, do come and teach. The children are so troublesome. There is only Miss So-and-so, and they are a great deal too much for her." Now, that is not the right way to tackle a layman. Should we not say, "These children are our children; the children of the Church, and it is your special privilege to train them up for the Church?" Make the work noble, and you will make the worker noble too. The mean estimation in which Sunday school teachers are held by the bulk of churchmen, arises from the mean idea we have of the work. I do not propose, however, to run through the list of ordinary Church work, but I should like to enquire if there is not some other way in which lay work might be usefully practised? First, I would speak of the work in which laymen touch the clergy, and next of the work in which they are combined. A practical difficulty laymen have—and it is very often a great one—is that when they begin in earnest to take part in Church work, which they are often told from the pulpit is peculiarly theirs, viz., that which contains the temporal matters of the parish, they are frequently met with the idea on the part of the clergy that they are going to invade their privileges, and to turn them out of their places. The first great thing a layman has to do, if he means to seek useful work, is to make the clergy understand that he has no wish to interfere with their special prerogatives. On the other hand, if the clergy will accept the labours of the laity as their portion of the work of the Church of Christ, they will find that the laity will not fail them. The clergy often complain of the apathy of the laity, but it is a too frequent experience of the latter that they are misunderstood when they begin to bestir themselves. The laity know in a minute whether they are trusted or not, and I hope the clergy will believe we have no other object than to help them when we do come forward. The clergy, not content with their own duties, will add to them, and sometimes substitute for them, the duties of the laity. The unsatisfactory state of so many subscription lists is one of the results of that system. The clergy beg and beg, but get no adequate response, and the result is that they often fill up the deficiency out of their own pockets. It would be a very practical work for a layman to look over the subscription lists of some of the religious societies, and repay the guinea of every poor parson he finds there. I wish some of those present would try the experiment of doing this, even if they confined themselves to three letters of the alphabet—a, b, and c,

for instance. Lay co-operation is new to most clergy, and to most laity, but. in the present crisis of the Church, it is a most necessary work. Whatever may be in store for the Church—and I am not one of those who believe disestablishment to be imminent—the best preparation for whatever is coming on us, is to obtain the capacity to manage our own affairs so thoroughly, that no one will ever be able to say a word against us. The clergy must be patient, and the laymen must not mind a few snubs from the clergy in the beginning. Another branch of laymen's work, relating especially to towns, is that of visiting houses and families in tenements. A friend tells me that a barrister of his acquaintance offered to visit three families one afternoon a week. His offer was accepted by the clergyman of the parish, and the amount of good done by this one gentleman among those three families is most remarkable. I think that if laymen would give their time to such work as this, it would be of great value in keeping all ranks of life together. From parochial work, I must pass on to diocesan work. Being chairman of the Lay Helpers' Diocesan Association, I know what advantage it is to have the laity authorised by the bishop to do some work which they are able to perform. I am happy to know that in the dioceses where this organisation has been started, it is being kept up, and I believe that the more it is done, the better the work of the Church will be carried out. As regards lay-helpers in the parish, I think that if the clergy would give themselves rather to training a few men, making them understand what is wanted of them, and then giving them head, guiding them with the eye, and not with the bridle, a great deal of good would be done. If a clergyman would train, say half-a-dozen men, he would spread his own influence through them, and there would be no fear of any collision between him and them. As to the laity becoming good preachers, that they would be held in higher esteem by the people than the clergy, that might happen in one or two cases, but certainly not in many. The experience I have had is that the laity are not much better preachers than the clergy, and I think the clergy may be well satisfied without wishing to impose any restrictions in that direction. There are one or two other things in which laymen's work may be most useful and real. In regard to the School Boards for instance, if the Church would exert herself to get good churchmen on those boards, a great deal might be done. That is a field exactly suited for laymen. In Parliament itself, I venture to think the laity have an enormous field of practical usefulness. There must be some here who employ a large number of men. I would point out that there is no better sphere for a layman's work than a well-ordered factory, and there is no sphere in which a layman could better prepare the soil for the reception of the Gospel, or more assist the growth of the seed of the Word of God. I am very earnest on this subject, especially as I think the point is not very often raised. A clergyman has access to these people once a week; a master, six days a week. The latter can reach them by his example, and by all kinds of good influences in a way in which no clergyman can. If a working man is preached to by a clergyman on a Sunday, and on six days in the week works in a place where he is taught everything that is evil, how can you trust only to the one day's work? The master of a factory has opportunities which are altogether impossible to a clergyman for giving righteous influences to his men, and I do hope that this meeting will have some tendency to promote religious feeling in the working of factories. Let the factory be a Christian home—it may be without losing any of its business character—let it be a good, honest, manly Christian home for the working people, and if it be made this, the laity in charge of it will assist very materially the work of the clergy.

Captain Montagu Burrows, R.N., and Chichele Professor of Modern History, Oxford.

Unlike the successful head of a great organisation who has preceded me, I come before the Congress as a layman, who represents no other work but his own, and that of a very humble description—a Sunday school teacher and district visitor. I might almost call myself an unsuccessful organiser. I believe I owe my selection as a speaker, on this occasion—an honour I was far from seeking—to my humble efforts in the Oxford Diocesan Conference to obtain a recognised position for lay workers in our diocese, and to establish organisations for that purpose. We have not been successful. Nine years ago, a committee of our Conference, of which I was a member, reported in favour of "Parochial Boards for Christian work;" but, as far as I know, though the Conference voted an unanimous approval of the proposal, nothing has come out of it. Still later, I was chairman of a committee appointed by the Conference to report upon the "Duty of the Church towards the Young;" and our report contained a recommendation that "associations of lay helpers should be formed in towns and populous villages;" but though I will not assert that nothing has been done to further the object of our committee, I can only say that at our last Conference, after three years of effort, the committee has been obliged to ask leave that it might be discharged. It found no sufficient response in the diocese. The clergy seemed not to like any fresh organisation, and they did not think a rural diocese was the place for it. Yet these measures had the support of our respected president, the bishop of our diocese, of his three archdeacons (who zealously attended our committee meetings), as well as of the leading clergy and laity of the diocese. This has set some of us thinking as to what the cause might be; and as in all probability other dioceses besides our own exhibit much the same general good will towards an improvement in the quantity and quality of lay work, but also experience precisely the same difficulty in making any progress, let me address myself to some considerations which have occurred to me.

Something has already been said about urban dioceses. In our great cities, I suppose no one will venture to express a doubt that an organisation of lay helpers, such as that over which Mr. Spottiswoode presides, meets a crying want. There, as has been correctly said, we find ourselves face to face with "a scanty and overworked clergy, a greatly underworked laity, and a practically heathen population." There, I suppose it will be admitted, that no scattered, invertebrate, half-hearted work of laymen will be of much use in dealing with the arrears of generations; but that success can only, humanly speaking, attend a business-like, vigorous, carefully governed society, in which clergy and laity alike find their part. I will speak, therefore, of rural dioceses like our own, though we have also our towns. These form, perhaps, the majority. Ought we, or ought we not, to take active steps to organise an association of lay helpers in every diocese?

Let us deal first with what we may call the passive resistance. May I humbly ask whether we ought not to go to the bottom of the whole matter and look the facts in the face? Must we not confess, however unpleasant the confession may be, that there is a need of some further organisation? Are we right in rejecting it? Are we not, both clergy and laity, accustomed to live very much in a fool's paradise? Even active clergymen—if I may venture to say so—seem sometimes to rest satisfied with their own punctual work in church, with the individual ministrations which are absolutely necessary, Sunday school, attendance in day school, the work of lady district visitors, parochial gatherings and libraries, temperance meetings, and so forth. They do all they can. But

how many of the youths and men do they gather into church? how many are communicants? In how many parishes is Dissent prevalent? How many parishioners are there who still require to be gathered out of the ranks of practical heathendom? How exceptional is it, even yet, to find mission-rooms and auxiliary chapels in the scattered hamlets of a large parish! These are the true tests.

But ought the clergyman to be satisfied with the fact that he can do no more? Should the matter rest there? Possibly the idea of taking the laity to his aid has scarcely struck him; for has not the great Oxford movement, which has now penetrated throughout the land, taught him that the one and only essential of a Church is the threefold apostolic ministry? Was not the teaching of all its leaders that "the clerical portion of the Church contained its only legitimate motive power"? Well, this was so. But have we not observed—or am I dreaming—that a certain change is gradually coming over the teaching of our own day, even amongst the highest churchmen? Perhaps we may date it, if such changes can date from a year or an individual, from 1868, when the present venerable Bishop of Salisbury delivered his famous Bampton Lectures. They came to many as a sort of revelation—one of those revelations of truth which, like the words of some great poet, carry a general conviction as soon as heard, and make people wonder why they had not themselves said it beforehand. It was now laid down that, in the language of Scripture, it is the Church entire and complete, not any class, or rank, or caste of persons within it, which is spoken of as the "Spirit-bearing body, the successor of Christ, the holder of power and privilege, in Christ." Bishop Moberly was "at a loss to discover the beginning of the doctrine that the truth was in such sort delivered to the bishops as that they alone, or even along with the presbyters, have the absolute right to consult or judge of it." In the very same year, 1868, the late lamented Archbishop of Canterbury announced his discovery—for even in 1863 he does not seem to have thought of lay help—that the new Lay Helpers' Association might afford him, with their unpaid services, potent help in working his unwieldy diocese. Perhaps, when once laid down, the agency through which this joint responsibility in Church matters of clergy and laity has made itself most felt is that of our mixed diocesan Conferences, now all but universally held from north to south, from east to west. The idea is becoming familiar. We may observe some indication of the change which has taken place. Only last August, in the diocese of Bath and Wells, an association of lay helpers sprang into most vigorous existence, as if by magic. At the first annual meeting, 137 parochial branches were reported to have been formed; there were 912 lay members, each paying the large sum of sixpence to the common fund; and there were 160 clerical associates. This remarkable beginning grew out of the report of a committee appointed by the diocesan conference. It made such an impression on the Bishop of Carlisle, who was the preacher, that he spoke of trying to form a similar association in his own diocese.

Let us suppose, then, that the theoretical difficulties are out of the way; that the clergy see urgent need for lay help of a good, practical kind; and that they have got over some very natural prejudices on the subject; still the difficulty which remains in a rural diocese has been stated to me, on high authority, as follows:—"The essence of a lay reader's position is, that he belongs to a parish, and will submit to work loyally in that parish, under the incumbent; we cannot find such men." For example, in the whole of this diocese, including Oxon, Berks, and Bucks, there are but twelve lay readers. I venture to reply—True, the number is small; but that is easily accounted for. (1) There is no association of lay helpers, from out of which body the lay readers should spring; and (2) You cannot expect elderly and middle-aged men—men in responsible situations, often married men,

or even many young ones, to give unpaid services—and that is what we are talking about—if they have to pass an examination, even in English subjects, and of a slight kind, as they have to do in our diocese. I am even surprised that twelve men have been found. The very idea is terrible to the lay mind. I hope I am not doing wrong in differing from my bishop on this point. Let us take it first :—We are able to appeal to facts. In the diocese of London, where there are nearly 200 lay readers, there is no such thing as an examination. The clergyman of the parish in which the lay reader is to work as his assistant, makes himself responsible to the bishop for his fitness. The bishop grants the license on the clergyman's recommendation. That has been found an ample guarantee, and what has answered in London will answer anywhere. The same course is followed in Bath and Wells, and Rochester. Such laymen as we require are naturally shy and retiring. They will not come where they are not wanted. They require to be brought forward and encouraged. If not perfectly fit for the work all at once, they become so after a very short time. It rests with the clergy to find out and lay hold of these men. It is in their hands.

And then to recur to our first point, if you really want to get the leading men —the men to make your efficient lay readers, you must create a rank and file of ordinary lay helpers ; and you must do this on a large scale, with a complete organisation, such as exists in some dioceses already. The materials will be found among the Sunday school teachers, the churchwardens, the choirmen, the schoolmasters, the squire, and the squire's sons, and such of the farmers and tradesmen as show any religious spirit. Let these be banded together as lay helpers in parochial branches of one Diocesan Society, in ruridecanal branches where the parishes are small, uniting on the simple principle of doing something for the Church of their baptism ; set this going, and the problem will be solved *ambulando*. One will encourage another ; a higher standard of lay churchmanship will be created ; each will feel that he has *something to do ;* and this is found to be the very secret of success in bodies outside the Church. The required lay reader will soon be forthcoming. There is not the slightest doubt about it.

There are, indeed, some reasons why the need of setting actively to work to create a body of lay readers is more urgent in a rural than an urban diocese. And here I can quote the words of the present Archbishop of Canterbury. Speaking at Canterbury last July, he is reported to have said :—" The whole class of mission chapels is now essential to our work. Due services and teaching in countless hamlets depends on the devotion of lay readers, and the provision of mission rooms." Just as the Salvation Army has recently exposed to our startled view the weak places in our towns, and taken up our neglected classes, so the Dissenters have for generations fastened upon the weak places in rural parishes, and taken possession of the outlying hamlets, new and old, which the single clergyman of the parish has been, as he thinks, obliged to leave alone. He truly says that he cannot be everywhere. Then let him pick out of his body of organised lay helpers the man or men whom he can best trust to do the duty for him, taking care, when he has obtained a license for him, neither to neglect him and leave him too much unsupported on the one hand, nor on the other to remind him of his inferiority too unsympathetically. What a change would come over this country if every diocese would take up its neglected spots in this spirit !—if instead of 700 lay readers in England we had 7,000, and instead of some 5,000 or 6,000 lay helpers, we had 100,000 ! Nor would the clergyman be the last to benefit by presiding over an association of church-workers in his parish. How much better he would feel the pulse of his flock ! how many delicate questions would gain by being handled in the

company of these men ! how much better would he be able to explain his motives, and remove misunderstandings ! how many of the cares of the parish might he devolve on others ! Might we not add that no little of the difficulty which besets the question of lay Councils would be removed by the organisation of lay work ? Let us have ruling laymen who do something for the Church as well as those who only talk about it. The apostle tells us : "If a man will not work, neither let him eat." It would be going too far to say : "If a man will not work for the Church, neither let him attempt to govern it," but it is not altogether an irrelevant idea.

One concluding remark. If there is an acknowledged want of competent lay readers, why do not our bishops and pastors make a point of preaching to laymen that they are not doing the whole duty required of them by the elevated standard of the Bible, unless they are engaged in advancing the kingdom of Christ in some active way ? As a rule, laymen never hear any such teaching, or receive any such invitation. And yet clergy and laity go on complaining that the Church makes no advance, and enlisting in all sorts of Defence societies, as if that were enough ! We may as well expect to conquer the stronghold of the enemy with a few scientific engineer officers, clever at all the theories of war, but absolutely powerless without the rank and file who are to go in with the bayonet, and do the practical work, as entrust the whole work of the Church to the clergy.

As to the name of Subdeacon, nothing can be better ; but why should it be made compulsory ? If anyone prefers that of lay reader, might he not retain it ? It is not the name we want so much as the thing.

The Hon. Thomas Henry William Pelham, Barrister-at-Law.

As this is the first time I have had the honour of addressing a meeting of the Church Congress, I think I may claim that indulgence which is always accorded to a maiden speech. It seems to be agreed that laymen's work is required for the Church at the present time, and I hope I shall not be thought in any way to deprecate any department of laymen's work. I firmly believe that his work is required in preaching, in furthering the temperance movement, in district visiting, in teaching children, and, more especially—and this is the subject which I wish specially to deal with—amongst young men. I confess I feel very great compassion and sympathy for those clergymen in large parishes who cannot obtain the assistance of any laymen in the very heavy work which falls upon them. It very often happens that a clergyman, after a great deal of difficulty and trouble, obtains the assistance of an able layman, and all goes smoothly for a time, and then some misfortune occurs. The layman goes to live in another place, or sickness prevents him going on with the work ; or perhaps he marries, and that very often, I am afraid, puts a stop to his usefulness. But, admitting the difficulty which a clergyman experiences in getting suitable lay helpers, I think that in some cases the clergy are to blame for not laying stress enough upon the necessity for all good churchmen and all good Christians to join in some active work for God. I think that the layman, as has been already said, is often invited to engage in some work of a nature which is very discouraging. He is asked to attend a committee, which after a time he feels to be a waste of time. He is asked to beg, which is perhaps the most disagreeable of all work. Some are invited to teach in Sunday schools—a branch of work which is often the only one open in a parish. After a hard week's work in professional duty it is a very irksome and disagreeable

thing, to some temperaments, to teach in a crowded room. They are sometimes asked to do more uninteresting things. A friend of mine went to speak at one of the Universities on the subject of how to attach young men to the Church. He enlarged for some time on the necessity for work, and he thought he had made a favourable impression. A young clergyman, however, got up after him, and said that he quite agreed with the last speaker, and that he had found it a most useful thing to give young men some work to do, and he had found it a good thing to ask them to clean the candlesticks in church. I am bound to say that if we are asked to engage in Christian work we do want something more interesting than that. I may state that last winter, at the London Diocesan Conference, a committee was appointed to enquire into the condition of young men engaged in the metropolis, and to find out what were the various institutions and societies for reaching them. The committee have received a large number of returns from various town clergy, and also from the rural parts of the diocese of London. We were very much struck by how much was being done, and yet when one considers the enormous number of young men in London it seems after all but a drop in the ocean. We find, in some cases, that there are very excellent institutions or guilds for the good young men—the communicants—but that hardly anything is being done to reach the outside young men, who require a special effort on their behalf. I believe this is true, not only of a large city like London, but in all our country towns, and that in every village where there is a church there are sufficient young men to justify some special effort being made for their benefit. I have not time now to enlarge on the different aspects of such a work, but there is a wide field here which so many earnest laymen might take up with advantage to themselves and for the good of others. There is the social work, such as the establishment of reading-rooms and entertainments, which may indirectly do much good. There is likewise much to be done educationally, and there is great room still in some parts for night schools, especially in connection with technical classes, for helping young men on in their trade. Above all, there is the special work which laymen may do most effectually amongst young men by means of Bible classes, meetings, and personal intercourse. I believe that such work, instead of forming additional labour for the brain and the body, will be found a pleasant change when business is over. There is a special work much needed amongst the rough class of boys in our towns and villages—the boys who hang about at the corners with their blacking boxes, idling nearly all day. I do not think the clergy can be expected to undertake such a work, but someone ought to take it up, and I believe he would not work without his reward. There is one thing laymen forget to use in church work. They employ some of their time and some of their money, but I think we should also use our houses for God's work, and I think some of us might use our parks and gardens for the same purpose. If any one takes up any work amongst young men he should make it his hobby, and not be in the least afraid of what others may say, but throw his whole heart into it. There is too much deputy work. People pay someone else to do the work, and then attend the committee and look on. That is, I think, a source of weakness. Then, I would say, do not be afraid of what your friends, even your good friends, may say. They are sure to try and prevent your doing good work. If you spend many of your days in hunting, and your nights in going to balls, they will let you alone, but if you are engaged till ten or eleven o'clock at night in some good work, you will find that your friends will try and put a stop to it. Above all things, I would say, make it a truly religious work, not regarding religion merely as the ultimate goal, but rather as the great lever with which to elevate these young men. I believe that religion is the greatest moral agent, and it ought to be so

used, in a simple, manly way. I do not suggest that gymnasiums and other amusements should be used merely as a decoy for drawing people into church or to a meeting, because I think they should be taken up for their own sake; but through it all there must be a decided, manly, religious tone. In conclusion, I may say that, although of course our great object should be to benefit the young men, I believe the work will be in every way beneficial to him who undertakes it. He will find, if he has not found it out before, that life is worth living; only he must remember that if he is to succeed he must practise some self-denial in it, and then I believe that on his death-bed he will be able to look back and feel that his life has not been in vain, and an additional joy in the future to which he looks forward will be the fact that there will be those there whom he may count as jewels in his crown.

DISCUSSION.

The CHAIRMAN.

JUST one word, touching a lapse which I think Professor Burrows made, and which I should be sorry to leave uncorrected, because otherwise it might lead some to form a somewhat erroneous notion of the diocese of Oxford, of whose honour I am a little jealous. I am sure Professor Burrows did not mean to say that there were only twelve persons engaged in lay work in the diocese, but that there were only twelve licensed readers. I understand him to intimate that that is what he did mean. It no doubt seems a very small number, and there are, I daresay, good reasons for it; but I must ask you to take into account the number of parochial organisations which appear in no report, although they have their own organisation. The clergy have, I dare say, their own hobbies about these things, and they like to do their work in their own way. But there are a great number of parochial agencies of which no formal report takes cognizance. We must further take into account the very large number of temperance organisations, which are made the basis of a great deal more than a mere advocacy of total abstinence, which lead on to something far beyond that, and which are working great good. As to the discouragement of the appointment of diaconal lay readers, you must remember what their office is. They have in this diocese, where they are licensed, a large measure of responsibility committed to them. They are practically, of course, teachers of the people, and they are just as much preachers as the first deacons were. It seems to me that our bishop, and his great predecessor—for in this matter the present bishop only followed in the steps of Bishop Wilberforce—could hardly license men to do this kind of work without something under the head of an examination. At the same time, you would be quite wrong in supposing that this implies any form of examination such as a young man has to undergo in a University, or which a candidate for orders has to pass. It is merely in the nature of a confidential communication either between the bishop and the candidate, or between one of the bishop's chaplains and the candidate, with the object of ascertaining whether the candidate is really sound in the faith; that he is a faithful and true member of the Church of England, and may be trusted, therefore, to go forth as a teacher. I do not think it possible that a lay reader could be invested with the authority he really has without something of this kind first taking place—something to enable the bishop to ascertain that such a one will teach what, according to the doctrine of the Church of England, is true, and not that which is erroneous.

JOHN TREVARTHEN, Esq., Provost of the Guild of St. Alban.

MY excuse for taking part in the discussion is, that I have been an active lay worker for more than twenty years, in a variety of ways. I am at this moment a lay preacher under the license of the Bishop of Rochester; and I have had some

experience of the arrangements which have been made in that diocese, as well as in the diocese of Winchester, for the appointment of laymen as authorised Church workers. I should like to bear testimony to the great satisfaction with which I heard the remarks of the last previous speaker; and I think the spirit of what Mr. Pelham said should run through all our advocacy of the appointment of lay helpers. Lay appointments ought not to be regarded as a kind of patronage of the few. What we want to lay down distinctly is, that it is the duty of the laity to consecrate their talents to the service of God in the Church, as far as their opportunities go, as it is the duty of the clergy to do so. Until the laity understand—men and women too—that every Christian is bound to carry out this work which lies upon them, we shall not find they have attempted to do their duty. When we have laid down this great principle that laymen are to be employed, as far as possible, as part of their Christian privileges, as well as of their bounden duty, we shall have a ready means at hand of meeting the great deficiency at present existing in the administration of the Church. I am, as my name implies, a Cornishman, and for the first nineteen or twenty years of my life I saw a great deal of what Nonconformist energy could do for the evangelisation and retention of the people to whom it addressed itself. In the county of Cornwall, were it not for the ministrations of the followers of Wesley, the people must almost have forgotten Christianity itself. Wesley was the apostle of a living Christianity in that county in these later days, and I think it my duty to bear witness to the faithfulness and the arduous labours of those who have taken up his work. They have gone on the principle of employing everybody who can be employed, and finding work for everybody who can work; and this is the principle we shall ourselves have to adopt if the Church is to do her work as it should be done. Then comes the question of putting the right peg into the right place. We shall not always get the square pegs into the square holes, and the round pegs into the round holes; but this is, of course, a question of the greatest importance, and to this point our organisations must tend. Time will not permit me to refer to all the varieties of work in which laymen have already met with encouragement and success. Emphasis has been laid on the great work for good to be accomplished in dealing with young men. I have been lately appointed, very unworthily, as provost of a large lay society, extending now, not only through England, but also through the colonies, known as the Guild of St. Alban. By this means I have been able to see, not only by my own personal experience, but by the experience of others, how much may be done by earnest-minded, zealous Church workers in every department of useful labour. I will only mention one case for the encouragement of young men who think of throwing in their lot with us. I have in my mind at this moment a place in the suburbs of London, where 700 young men are provided with healthy recreation, educational and religious instruction, every night of the week, including Sundays, as far as there is time, and the whole of the machinery of the institution is worked by one of our members, who is certainly one of the mildest and most modest laymen that could be found in this country. He could not, of course, do all the work himself, but he is the mainspring of the whole thing. It began with a class or two, but has gradually extended itself, until now it costs something like £800 a year to keep it up, which the members largely provide. I mention this to show if men will set to work in the right way how much success may be met with. Enough emphasis has, perhaps, been laid on the fact that laymen are not employed as extensively as they might be. We want to provide different kinds of services; we want a great deal more elasticity. I do not wish to speak disrespectfully of the ordinary service of the Church—far otherwise; let us have them as we ought to, more than we have already; but they will never in their usual stereotyped form do all the work required to be done. A great deal may be done which the clergy cannot be expected to do, and which, I believe, that beautiful act of uniformity will not allow them to do. The fact is, I think we are nearly starved to death through the respectability of our system, and it is time we opened our eyes to it. The more liberal and elastic our arrangements can be made, the more success may be expected to attend them. What is to be done, in the first place, to secure the right sort of men? We have to show them first of all the necessity for the work; to show them that it is the duty of every Christian man to do the work; to show them that the bishops are ready to give them every encouragement, and to license fitting men, and we may then look for the right material to come forward. People must not expect that because we have had a certain number of diocesan societies in existence for some years there should be a fine crop of lay help. For how many years past have people thought it impossible that laymen could do anything of the kind? We have to get

over the *vis inertia* of past times, and laymen have to learn that their services will be welcomed by the clergy. Taken as a whole, I think laymen are very shy, and have to get over a large amount of nervousness. We want a great deal of drawing out, and I hope the clergy will take pity on us, and will give us every encouragement possible. At the last Congress I ventured to say that I thought because the diaconate had become merely an apprenticeship to the priesthood, we had lost a link between the clerical and the lay orders. I must reiterate that opinion. A previous speaker apprehended that great difficulty would be occasioned through deacons being employed in lay work. I believe, however, it is not unknown in England that many of the clergy proper are employed in other than clerical duties, and I can conceive that there is a large amount of that quasi-clerical employment which might be available to the lay-deacon. I must say that Mr. Armfield's paper, though showing a good deal of learning and powers of observation, has failed to convince me that a real primitive diaconate is impracticable in our Church to-day. It was not unknown in ancient times for a man who could be chief among the apostles to get his living by making tents. Although we do not go so far as that, we may admit the principle that men may be occupied in their daily professions, and yet be competent to undertake the office of a deacon in the Church. I think there might be a great amount of liberty allowed as to duties. It was certainly so in the early days of the Church, for as it has been well said, the great Apostle of the Gentiles was persecuted to death while in charge of the alms of the people; and the first Christian martyr was put to death, because, though a deacon, he was too successful as a preacher.

The Rev. C. J. THOMPSON, Vicar of St. John's, Cardiff.

As a parish priest, I may, I think, speak on behalf of all my brethren, when I say we are not at all afraid of lay co-operation or lay help of any kind whatever, but that we are always ready to welcome it with all our hearts. I want, however, to ask this question. What practicable work can we get laymen to do? When we come to a Church Congress, I am afraid we meet with the model layman, rather than the ordinary layman, and I ask what can you get the ordinary lay helper to do? To answer this question, let me first ask what are laymen specially fond of? or what is the special province in which they would be likely to do a great deal better than the clergy? Well, they have much more to do with money than the clergy. I do not say that they are fonder of it. That might be matter of debate; but that they have much more of it than the clergy we have already heard, and I am not sorry that it is so. They have a great deal more than I hope the clergy ever will have. I only wish there was less difficulty in getting it from them; but perhaps for that very reason you cannot have better treasurers for societies than the laity are at all times likely to be. The most important thing with regard to money is that the laity should keep it, that the churchwardens, for example, should have control over the money, and that the vicar should have nothing to do with it except in co-operation with them. I will pass rapidly over the usual ways in which laymen are now ready to help their parish priests. Take Sunday school teaching for example. In my own parish 200 adult persons of ages ranging from 18 to 30 are weekly taught by lay teachers. I may also pass over district visiting, and just say one or two words on what I should like to be regarded as the special work of laymen, viz., helping the clergy to preach the Gospel of the Grace of God. I know a parish in which but a short time ago three mission rooms, worked on Church lines, were committed, first with the greatest trust, and next with the greatest success, to four lay readers licensed by the bishop. In that parish there is no jealousy whatever between the clergy and the laity. Of course we clergy are quite aware that there is a vast amount of latent eloquence which only requires encouragement to be forthcoming in the laity. We have just been told that the laity preach a great deal better than the clergy. All I can say is that we are only too glad to know that there is this mine of wealth yet to be worked, and all of us will try when we go back to our parishes to bring it to the surface. I take it that the main reason why we are so anxious about the co-operation of our lay brethren is that we want some means by which the clergy can be kept in touch with the masses of the people, and by which the masses can the better be brought to receive the spiritual ministrations of their clergy. I know no better method of effecting this than that which has been largely adopted in many dioceses, of investing our laymen by episcopal sanction, blessing, and

authority, with a certain measure of ministerial usefulness and power. They have their gifts ; sometimes they are much more gifted for certain purposes than the clergy. Let us not look down on preaching and teaching. Our Church is a teaching Church. Let us remember that there are gifts among our lay friends which can be utilised, and may be as successfully used as those which we ourselves possess. But there are other ways in which it seems to me laymen may nobly work, if they will, for God and man. I was greatly gratified to hear the noble, the humane, the unselfish remarks of Mr. Pelham. He touched a chord which has long vibrated warmly and vehemently within my own soul. In my parish there are streets of squalid poor, and streets of honest working men, but comparatively few open spaces, gardens, and orchards. I ask myself this question, why should not the owners of large orchards and gardens distribute of their wealth the fruit that is often rotting on the trees, and the flowers which they know not what to do with, broadcast through the town. I expect there is many a vicar of a large parish who would be glad to take fruit and flowers to the poor if they knew how to get them. Mr. Pelham has spoken of laymen who have large houses with parks and gardens inviting the poor to them. Is there anything, I would ask, which would break down all hateful barriers of caste more effectually than that? What we want is, not to gather our poor people into schoolrooms—although we welcome them there, and do our best to make them look bright and cheerful—but to throw open our houses and make our poor brethren and sisters feel that they are brothers and sisters indeed ; to grasp them by the hand, and to have them at our own tables, under the guidance, of course, of proper discretion and judgment. May I throw out another suggestion, which may seem to some Quixotic, and to others terribly revolutionary and radical. Well, I am not afraid of either term. What a waste of precious life there is which might be gathered up and garnered, picked up by the hand of love as fragments from the dust and made meet for the Master's use ! Think of the poor dear little ones who in many large parishes are left fatherless and motherless. Why should they go to workhouses? Why should they not be taken in faith and love to gladden a childless home, to become faithful and loyal children of God's Church, jewels and gems in the crown of our Lord Christ? It is not a Quixotic thing ; it is a practical thing for laymen and laywomen to take in hand, and a work which they ought to be specially qualified to do. What would have a more blessed permanence and more practical effect than some such work as this, undertaken in the firm heartfelt belief and trust that we are one in Christ Jesus, members of the Body of which He is the Head, and everyone members one of another.

James Henry Millard, Esq., Superintendent of St. Mary's Episcopal Sunday School, Reading.

If an apology were needed for standing before you to-night, unknown, as I probably am, to nine-tenths of those present, a sufficient excuse may, I trust, be found in the fact that I have for some twenty-five years been engaged in Church work in the town, and that I am at the present moment, conjointly with two most estimable Christian ladies, superintendent of a school numbering nearly 1,000 children. I have had, therefore, many opportunities of judging of the great need for more earnest and zealous lay work in connection with the Church. Underneath the crust, so to speak, of our cities and large towns are to be found, still uninfluenced by the Gospel of Christ, those who are practically as far from God as the heathen who roams in the centre of Africa. When I tell you that not long ago I met with a man who told me he thought there was such a person as God, and when I spoke of the Saviour Jesus Christ, looked at me with blank astonishment, surprised that I should ask him if he knew there was such a holy and gracious Being, you will, I think, agree with me that there is increasing need for earnest evangelistic work. There are hundreds and thousands of our people who must be looked after in their homes, for the simple reason that they will not come to the services of the Church. Surely, if they will not come to hear the Gospel, the laymen can be employed in taking the Gospel to them, by conducting Cottage Meetings and Mission Hall Services in thickly-populated districts. That there are in the Church of England those who are willing to give much of their time (and frequently after a hard week's work) to labour on the

Sabbath Day, is proved by the fact which appeared the other day, that there are upwards of 3,000 lay helpers in the diocese of London. I thought that looked well for the great metropolis of the world. But we want lay helpers to come forward in connection with the work of our own towns and villages, and I earnestly trust that we laymen will not be fettered by anything which has been suggested by previous speakers. Laymen are willing to devote their whole time to the work of God; and if they are so willing, I think that at all events they ought not to be allowed to run the risk of being hauled up before a Court, or anything of the kind, for engaging in duties which they honestly believe in their hearts ought to be carried out. A remark has been made with reference to getting hold of the young men. I may perhaps be privileged to speak on that point more fully when the discussion respecting Sunday schools takes place. I may say, however, that when the youths who have gone through our Sunday schools arrive at the age of 16 or 17 they gradually go away from us, if no proper place has been provided for them to meet in. They slip away from the Christian influence under which they have been, perhaps, for many years—are practically driven away, because the great question of retaining them has not been fairly and fully dealt with. In connection with our own school, I may say that we have recently built nine or ten large schoolrooms; and in one of those rooms, where there are seats for about forty, every Sunday morning and afternoon, in addition to my work as superintendent, I conduct a class which is regularly attended by a large number of young men, most of whom have been through our school, and who had ceased to come. Now we have provided a proper room for them, they gladly come back, and are now eager listeners to God's Word. I throw this out as a suggestion to those who have been considering how to influence the elder scholars in Sunday schools. We all recognise that lay work is capable of being a great lever and help in our beloved Church, and if we are to retain the Church in her present high and proud position, we must train up the young in such a way that they will love to come and hear the Gospel proclaimed in our churches, and in due time will be able to help us. With regard to work in the villages, I am sure that many clergymen, if they knew that laymen who were ready to help were to be found at a reasonable distance, they would be glad to avail themselves of their services. I think there is no person more entitled to our sympathy than the clergyman of a country parish. He is probably without a curate; he preaches in the morning, and conducts the whole service, and does the same in the afternoon. Three services on a Sunday, for a clergyman who is busy visiting his parishioners every day in the week, is more than you can expect any man to do, and yet the agricultural labourer has probably only the Sabbath morning when he can attend his church. Much good might be done if it were possible to establish in every town a Lay Helpers' Association, which could send men out to work on the Sunday, according to a plan based on the excellent system of the Nonconformists. I know men among the Nonconformists who walk 35 miles on a Sunday to conduct a service far away from their homes. I believe that laymen of the Church of England would be willing to help in such a good work; and I hope one of the results of the Congress will be that a fresh stimulus will be given to lay work, and that our clergy will be brought to feel that great help can be obtained from laymen in preaching the Gospel of Christ throughout the land.

The Rev. W. CARLILE, of the Church Army.

IT has been my lot during the last year to spend a considerable portion of my time in the streets of London, and other towns, and more especially at the corners of public-houses. Even during the last few days, in several of the larger towns, I have come across placards and notices respecting "Nationalisation of the Land," and "appropriation of the country," that made me tremble lest my children, or grandchildren, if I should ever have any, should have a very rough time of it. I take it that the subject for discussion may include the solution of that awful question, which I feel will have to be dealt with in some way or other, respecting the under-current of communism, socialism, and Nihilism, which is already very powerful in our land. I have no doubt there are many who do not believe this. Many clergymen will scarcely believe it is so. I ask you, if you doubt it, to go to any of our men at one of the 39 stations of the Church Army in this country, and they will soon point to the place of danger. I believe to-night's subject brings before us a distinct and practical solution of the danger that is coming over the land. That solution seems

to be found in lay work. The clergy are largely overworked; the majority of us can do no more than we are doing, and the solution of this difficult question is, I believe, to be found in the hands of the laity themselves. The laity, I believe, have it in their power to deal with the root of the matter, not simply by means of those useful organisations and excellent institutions for the improvement of the dwellings of the poor, and so forth, but because they can implant Christianity in the hearts of the very lowest strata of society, and so deal with communism and socialism in such a way that its influence vanishes. It has been found that the work has been more easily done by the working men in many parishes than by the vicar, although there is some difficulty in getting the right men. I have tried myself to get working men to go out into the streets, and they have said, "No; we would rather hear you speak." At last I got a working man to promise to speak; and although he said, "I can only speak for five minutes, or I shall break down," he drew the other men after him as I could not do. So we put a working man forward, authorised by his vicar, and under his control—for we have made a point of conducting our services under the direction of the vicar of the parish—and that man will go out supported by communicants, and will reach people whom we cannot reach ourselves. After learning a working man and sending him forth, I have seen him reach characters that I could not get to listen to me in any way. It was on this account that we made an effort not quite a year ago to supply the clergy with a working man trained for the purpose, and ready to place himself entirely under the control of the vicar of the parish. We found that the working man soon became a self-supporting agency in the parish, and that if he does real, good work, teaching the drunkard to lead a godly life, and so on, money is provided by the drunkard to carry on the work, so that nearly every station that is made becomes self-supporting. The working man developes the speaking power of others. There is many a working man who can be kicked and have his head cut open, who can be knocked down by a publican, and yet turn round and smile at him, and praise God he does not feel any angry feelings in his heart. I have seen a man with his head cut open, and lying on the ground, get up and talk most kindly and gently to the men who have so ill-treated him. I believe that this spirit goes also into the hearts of others. Men who have been making 30s. or £2 a week, sometimes even as much as £3, will come to us and work for 28s., and they will reach those who are outside the fold. The fold is well provided for by bishops, priests, and deacons, but we have not enough workers to go among the sheep that are without the fold. It is possible that a working man might form a clique round himself, or make a sort of little local schism. I believe, however, that can be obviated by a very easy plan. When the working man, who has done his best for three or four months, becomes as it were played out because he has not the power of study, he can pass on to another place. We are endeavouring to adopt that principle all over the land. I find that the poorest of the poor, instead of having any antipathy towards the Church of England, gladly become church people if they are rescued from sin by church people, and they are very pleased to be prepared for confirmation, and to become regular communicants. I could point to station after station where you would find that where the layman has gone he has drawn the lowest to Christ. Where the vicar gives his hearty, warm grip, the convert is soon made to feel that he is welcome to the Church. In one instance, after a working man had been two months at work, 180 adults came forward for confirmation. I believe, therefore, that we have now a solution of this question, and if we will only lay aside our prejudices, and allow the work to go on, there will be a great ingathering of the masses into our dear old Church. If we will go out into the street, take off our kid gloves, and never mind a little mud or scoffing, we shall not drag the Church of England into the mud, but I believe we shall be able to drag the mud into the Church of England.

The Rev. J. COWDEN-COLE, Vicar of Upton, Somerset.

IT is with some difficulty I follow the previous speakers; but, I think a word ought to be said in behalf of the lay Church work that is going on in our midst. We are accustomed to say, perhaps, that too little Church work is being done by laymen; but I venture to think, that when we look around us, we shall find that such is not the case, and that even in the humblest parishes in the country, genuine Church work is being done by laymen. I think, however, that lay Church work ought to be more strictly defined. With regard to the lay preacher, for instance, is he to be held as

having a distinct and specific office in the Church, or not? I think that that question has already been solved for us. We can point to numerous instances, where the lay-preacher finds sufficient scope for his labours in a parish without interfering with the work of the clergy. Then, again, there are instances of important diocesan work being done by laymen. All we have to do, then, I say, is to build upon what is already going on, widening the area of the layman's work, and giving a greater scope to the energies of those laymen who are engaged in it. I do not think we need any of us be jealous of what a layman can do. We have only to trust him fully, and to believe that he will work, not only in a spirit of independence, but also with the desire to do his best for the common Church of which we all are members. From very remote times the layman's work has been recognised, and I do not think we can possibly do without that work. The qualifications of the layman and those of the clergyman run very much in the same groove. Before we were clergymen we were laymen, so that we have been through the whole thing, and know what can be done, and what ought to be expected from a layman. We ask, I say, in conclusion, for the laity to show more interest in Church questions; and, I think, also, that we as clergy ought to show more interest in lay questions. For my own part, I rejoice that I belong to a Church whose roots go deep down into the secular life of the people; and, remembering the fact, we may well, I venture to think, trust a layman's work in the Church.

The Rev. HENRY OVERY, Vicar of St. Veep, Cornwall.

I LISTENED with the greatest interest to the remarks which fell from Mr. Trevarthen, and they stirred in me feelings which can only be explained by the fact that we each come from the same county of Cornwall. I have seen a great deal of work done, or, as I would venture to say, mis-done, by the local preachers of the Wesleyan Connexion. Yet what they and the leaders of the Salvation Army have done cry shame on the clergy of the Church of England. They have, nevertheless, accomplished their work in an irregular and unsatisfactory manner, and in a manner which cannot satisfy Churchpeople. The great dangers of Nihilism and Materialism threaten us; and while the local preachers, like the leaders of the Salvation Army, have set themselves to rescue the masses, it belongs to the Church and its force to bring them back, I will not say to the Church of England, but to the Church Catholic of Jesus Christ our Lord. While the need is so great, I would say, Do not debate among yourselves as to whether you should appoint lay readers or lay deacons. I have given some attention to the requisites of preparation for both, but the needs of the present time are so urgent and extreme that you would do well to appoint both lay readers and deacons. Do not be satisfied until in every parish you have preaching stations or mission rooms, from which every man, woman, and child in the parish can be reached. A parish is defined ecclesiastically as "the people who live round about the church," so that to the pastor is committed the souls of the parish, or of the people who live round about the church. We never need be afraid of the laity. We welcome them. We are members of one Body. We have one Lord, one Faith, one Baptism. To us clergy is given the pastoral care of the people. So the laity may be given, with us, the work of preaching. *If* the laity can preach better than we can, in God's name let them do it, and the best of the clergy will be the foremost to welcome them. With regard to the work itself, I will make this distinction between the laity and the clergy: although a clergyman never ceases to be a layman, a layman is not a clergyman. The layman should confine himself to practical exhortation, and the clergyman to teaching, to prayer, and to the Sacraments. Why should it not be said to the extended diaconate, and to lay readers, "Take thou *authority* to preach the Word of God." What I desire to see accomplished s that the lay deacon or reader should be duly authorised by the bishop to work, so that his labours should not be *self*-authorised, loose, and unsystematic, but authoritative, deriving its authority from "men who have public authority given unto them in the congregation to call and send ministers into the Lord's vineyard," and connected with the whole of official Church work. The question of examination or no examination is not, in my opinion, one for us now to discuss. We want the men; the work is waiting for them, and we wish to fit them for the work. If only they will give themselves "first unto the Lord, and unto us by the will of God," and will so conform to apostolic precept, we, and all the parishes of the Church, shall be the gainers.

CONGRESS HALL,

WEDNESDAY MORNING, OCTOBER 3RD.

The LORD BISHOP OF WINCHESTER in the Chair.

WOMEN'S WORK.

(*a*) SISTERS.
(*b*) DEACONESSES.
(*c*) DISTRICT VISITORS.
(*d*) MISSION WOMEN.

PAPERS.

The Rev. T. T. CARTER, Hon. Canon of Christchurch, Clewer, Windsor.

SISTERHOODS represent that side of the Christian life which our Lord taught when He drew certain women to devote themselves wholly to His service; and this state of life is recognised by St. Paul in well-known passages as existing in his time. Such devotion was at first of single women only, dwelling mostly apart in their own homes. The gathering together into communities dates from the fourth century. To be of lasting use to the Church such women need to be gathered into communities. Sister Dora achieved her wonderful work alone. She has passed away and left nothing behind her. If the full results of such great gifts as God vouchsafes from time to time to His Church, are to be preserved, they must be embodied in organised societies. I assume that the *work* of Sisterhoods is generally understood and approved, and needs no witness to its value. My remarks will be confined to two points only—the constitution of Sisterhoods, and the life of Sisters.

First, as to the constitution of Sisterhoods. They claim, as distinct societies, certain liberties within the general action of the Church. The chief points to be secured to them are these:—They should have, first, their voice in the appointment of the Superior. They should hold their chapters to determine internal matters of business. They should manage their own funds. They should have a settled rule, and be governed according to their rule, not by the mere personal will of their Superior—the Superior herself acting according to rule as well as the Sisters. Sisterhoods have thus a constitutional, not an absolute government. They are as an army, and, as in an army, obedience is their watchword. Sisters go forth as they are sent, and act under their Superior. They have thus an unity in action, and this is their strength.

An important question arises at this time as to the future of Sisterhoods in the Church of England, the question of their relation to the

bishops. There are different views on the matter, but generally the practice of the Church has certainly been, that a supervision should be vested in the bishops, and that the rule of a Sisterhood should be sanctioned and guarded by the bishop. The bishop becomes then the guarantee for the community to the Church, and his blessing sanctifies its acts of devotion. It would be hardly possible now to enter more into detail on this question, but I may add that we have happily in this diocese an example of what the fatherly care of the bishop may be towards Sisterhoods, for which we cannot be too thankful. For orderly working, too, it is necessary that if Sisters work in parishes they should be subject to the parish priest in parochial matters, and if in hospitals to the medical officer in medical matters. Much has been said of late as to councils, and their relation to Sisterhoods. I would speak with deference on a subject on which there may be, and has been, difference of opinion, but my own conviction is, that councils are a very valuable help to Sisterhoods in externals, but only in externals; and that it were fatal to a Sisterhood for a council to take part in its interior management, either by appointing its Superior, or by framing or regulating its rule. A Sisterhood is a family—a mother, and her daughters—and, while families need their proper head, they would not brook to be managed by a board.

It has been asked whether Sisterhoods can rightly be instituted as diocesan institutions? Ordinarily there would be great difficulties in such an arrangement. There may be exceptional cases, and Bishop Webb has formed a Sisterhood on this principle in Bloemfontein. But with us in England the difficulties would be, that Sisterhoods cannot be limited to dioceses, and yet for united action the central authority must always reside in the mother house, and, besides, our over-worked bishops would have to act through a diocesan board, and the same objections would apply to such a board as to a council.

The essential point in the members of a Sisterhood is a vocation to this particular form of life. We must recognise special vocations as God's calling to individual souls. A vocation is judged of by the dispositions of the mind. If there be, with right dispositions, outward circumstances favourable to the choice, then there is both the inward seal of the Spirit of God to mark the vocation, and the outward witness of His Providence to approve it. Ample time always is allowed to test the vocation —ordinarily at least two years and a-half, six months as a postulant, and two years in a noviciate. If after such testing a Sister is accepted, then follows the formal dedication, which marks her off by a distinctive separation from the world, She enters thus a consecrated state of life, believed to be of God calling her to that holy estate, and therefore to be regarded as life-long.

And here I touch an extremely delicate question, yet one that cannot be avoided,—that of Vows. What is a vow? Is it not the expression of an inward resolve? Is it not the declaration of what the soul believes to be God's will for its particular case? It is on this ground that Sisters desire to take vows. They feel it to be the expression of a simple truth, and it protects them before the world. It is a strength to a Sister, just as in all cases the outward acknowledgment of an inward purpose is naturally desired, and is felt to be the pledge of its truth. And if there be proper care, and sufficient testing, and a sufficient age, can it be said that such vows are unlawful?

The question of age is indeed most material. Certainly I am no advocate for what the Archbishop of Canterbury lately said he knew to have been once done, that such a vow was allowed to be taken at *fifteen* years of age. But, on the other hand, what the revered Bishop of Lincoln has ruled, that vows of celibacy ought not to be taken under *sixty* years of age, must appear to any one very odd, and scarcely needful.* The Bishop grounds his rule on St. Paul. But St. Paul's "unmarried woman," "who careth for the things of the Lord" (1 Cor. vii. 34), is different, as all commentators witness, from the "widow," who was "not to be taken into the number under three score years old" (1 Tim. v. 9). And Sisters feel the difference, and claim the privilege given in primitive and Scriptural times to the consecrated virgin, that her vows should be recognised and sanctioned by Church authority.

But it is urged, and rightly urged, may there not possibly be error in the original choice? and also may there not be change of circumstances, such as overstrain of mind under the pressure of the life on particular temperaments? One cannot deny these possibilities. And if so, what then? In such cases there is need of the dispensing power, and there always has been in religious communities the exercise of a dispensing power. And does not such a power properly reside in those to whom our Lord has given authority "to bind and to loose"? Or has the Church of England forfeited such power? It has also been the custom of late years in foreign communities that such vows should be only periodically taken, and renewable, say at intervals of three or five years, and this not at all as supposing that a Sister's dedication is on this account regarded as temporary, but only as showing that external force does not constrain those who have given themselves to the Lord as a free-will offering. And if Convocation ever sanction Sisterhoods with vows, it might, in like manner, see cause to adopt such a use for its approval.

And now, secondly, as to the life of Sisters. Public opinion is often much at fault in this respect. It is not uncommon to suppose that a Sister is *ipso facto* already perfect, and then if any faults are seen there comes a reaction, and the whole system is disparaged, just as it is said superstitious people abroad do with their saints, first worship them, and then, if they don't fulfil their wishes, break their images. Sisters are women still, and are liable to commit faults. What distinguishes Sisters from others is their *aim*. They choose what they believe to be the highest aim in the love of Christ and for Christ's service; and for this, and to perfect themselves in this, they willingly accept discipline, and rule, and restraint, in order that, as St. Paul says, "they may be holy both in body and in spirit."

But on this very account of "restraint," it is common to reproach Sisters. It is said, "They are no longer free, as responsible persons ought to be." But in what respect are they under restraint? The rule they live under they have accepted willingly after trial of it, believing it to be for their higher good. They give up their freedom only as the

---

* "*Sisterhoods and Vows.*" A letter to the Ven. Archdeacon Prevost, by the Lord Bishop of Lincoln. 2nd edition. (Rivingtons.) May I be allowed to refer to a reply of mine to this letter in a pamphlet entitled, "*Vows and the Religious State.*" (Masters.) 22 c.

soldier does—that is to say, for the development of the greater results, both to themselves and their service. What is the true idea of liberty? It is not opposed to obedience; on the contrary, it is the being obedient to the highest rule, with the use of the highest powers, set free from entanglements, and for the highest ends. In this sense "perfect freedom" is to be found only in the "service of God." And the Sisterly idea of service is a fulfilment in their measure of this principle. They give up their own will, not their own conscience, to act together in an undistracted and undivided service—in the free concentration of all their powers, in the way, and for the end, which they believe to be the highest within their reach. It is this which gives power to their work, singleness to their devotion, and quietness to their minds. And is not this idea of liberty the groundwork of all heroism, and the animating principle of the highest forms of love?

Perhaps what popularly tells most against Sisterhoods at present is the feeling that to become a Sister is to break or to disparage home ties. But is this a fair charge? Certainly family claims must ever be the first of all claims. This I assume; but, supposing real family claims to be satisfied, and supposing a woman free to marry, yet not desiring marriage, but desiring to be a Sister, then where is the breach of home ties, if at a responsible age, able to choose, she seek to follow this desire? Nor does it disparage marriage—God forbid!—as a holy estate, honourable among all men. But the Church has recognised the virgin life also as a holy estate—as a state to which some are called and fitted by God, and it speaks of this estate in connection with the marriage service, when it speaks of those who may be endued with the "gift of continency." There is a pure Divine love as well as a pure human love; love to Christ as One to whom the soul may dedicate itself, and in whose service to spend itself—not as loving home less, but as loving Christ more, and drawn by such longing to exercise its energies and its gifts for His dear sake. To use the words of the Bishop of Grahamstown,* speaking of the Sister: "The only way," he says, "in which a Sister's life can be explained is, that she has seen the vision of Celestial Beauty. In Him she finds her all-in-all, her life-long love; and her exceeding great reward is the smile that He gives when 'she hath done what she could.'" If this be true, and if the course is fairly open to a woman at a fitting age, who believes herself so called of God, why not allow for this belief as a reality in the kingdom of Christ, and why stamp on such a woman the distressing stigma of a disregard of family ties? Should it not rather be to a Christian family a joy, though with it there be sacrifice, as in all devotion there is sacrifice—a joy in surrendering a daughter to such a destiny, and thus to taste something of Hannah's blessing in "lending" her Samuel "to the Lord"?

Again, it is said that Sisters are selfish in evading the burdens of every-day life, and leaving them to be borne by others. But is it selfish or self-sparing to give one's life to live with the defiled outcasts of society, in order by loving care to restore them to society and to God? Is it selfish to give one's life night and day to nurse all forms of disease?

---

* "*Sisterhood Life and Woman's Work in the Mission Field of the Church*," by the Right Rev. Allan Becher Webb, D.D., Bishop of Grahamstown. (Skeffington and Son.)

Is it selfish to give one's life to ceaseless toil in the crowded alleys and unwholesome chambers of the destitute in our great cities, or to face all climates in foreign lands to follow the wanderers of our people and comfort them in their necessities? Are such objects of life visionary? Are they without the cross? Are they needless objects for which to provide? And has not woman gifts peculiarly her own, or, if shared with man, given to her in greater measure than to man—gifts of devotion, of sympathy, of persuasiveness, of communicativeness, most influential over hearts and over souls? And is it not well that in some cases at least, even from among our best, such gifts should be wholly consecrated, wholly sealed to the service of Him Who gave them? And is it fair to say to delicate, refined women, who choose such a lot, that they do it to escape life's burdens?

A Sister's life, again it is said, is liable to be morbid. Certainly the history of religious communities gives solemn warning as to the possibility of highly developed devotional temperaments becoming unhealthy. But may there not be similar cases everywhere, as there is similar liability everywhere in the case of exceptional religious ardour? Experience has shown that active work is a very real counter-influence to such a tendency, and it is to be noted that all the Sisterhoods hitherto instituted amongst us are, as far as I am aware, working orders. And so great is the cry for help among our suffering masses, that it is probable that this will generally, at least, be the case. The fear at present is lest there be not sufficient time for prayer, when yet a life of prayer is the real power of the Sister's life. The effort, at all events at present, is to unite the life of Martha with the life of Mary, as both alike devoted to our Lord.

In conclusion, I would ask, if the good Spirit of God is reviving among us, in our latter days, something of apostolic zeal, and has chosen among the daughters of our land, among our nobles as among our peasants, many who count it a joy to leave all for love of Christ and His service, to live and die in the bond of an everlasting union; and if the condition of our society is such as to demand every sort of devoted service to do His work, and to reveal His life among His people,—is it not to be desired that His grace may remove all prejudices from the minds of men, that He may show them that English domestic life, however holy and beautiful, is not the only form in which He is to be honoured by women; that God inspires different vocations among His elect; that between the matrons and the virgins of our people there may be an honourable rivalry in good works; that by the virtues of both working in harmony He may be glorified, and thus the full measure of the Christian ideal of womanhood be set forth in its power and its beauty in the midst of us?

That the Church of England has recognised and accepted Sisters' *work* is a gain to the life of the Church of England; but it remains still for the Church of England to recognise and accept the *life* of Sisters, and what that life needs for its support and its nourishment, and for this the prayers of all who love the Church of England as God's instrument for the life and peace of England, are surely to be earnestly desired.

(*b*) Deaconesses.

The Very Rev. J. S. Howson, Dean of Chester.

I find it quite impossible to read this paper without calling seriously and vividly to mind the discussion of the same subject at the Church Congress of 1862 in this diocese. That was, for two reasons, a remarkable occasion. In the first place, this very institution of the Church Congress, the first meeting of which had been held at Cambridge in the previous year, sprang suddenly, under the chairmanship of Bishop Wilberforce, into strong and mature life. But also a remarkable debate took place on that occasion upon the broad subject which is now before us. That debate, too, might, I think, be described by the same word "mature." I doubt whether, as regards general principles, much is likely to be said here to-day that was not in substance said in Oxford then.

Yet since that time great progress has been made, both in public opinion and in experiment. I may remind you that this same subject has been discussed, under various designations, in the Church Congresses of York, Dublin, and Stoke-upon-Trent, and that these meetings have been like stepping-stones across a period of anxious thought. It may, I think, be useful to glance at this progress, so as to see more distinctly where we stand at this moment.

(i.) First, there is the founding of the London Deaconess-Institution, about that very same time, under the late Archbishop Tait, who (as was shown by a published letter from his deathbed) never relaxed his sympathetic hold on this subject. The foundation of other Deaconess-Institutions has followed in the dioceses of Ely, Winchester, Canterbury, Chester, Salisbury, and in East London. Thus a large amount of experience has been gathered together, the pressure of difficulties has been felt, warnings have been supplied, and encouragement likewise.

(ii.) Another definite topic, on which stress must be laid, is this, that in 1871, under the presidency of the present Bishop of Winchester, a paper was drawn up, after very careful consultation, embodying certain principles and definitions, which were thought to meet the new demand for a Diaconate of Women, after the manner of early times, in the modern Church of England. From this paper I will simply quote the following:—"(1.) A Deaconess is a woman set apart by a bishop, under that title, for service in the Church. (2.) No Deaconess or Deaconess-Institution shall officially accept or resign work in a Diocese without the express authority of the bishop of that diocese, which authority may at any time be withdrawn. (3.) No Deaconess shall officially accept work in a parish (except it be in some non-parochial position, as in a hospital or the like), without the express authority of the incumbent of that parish, which authority may at any time be withdrawn. (4.) In all matters not connected with the parochial or other system under which she is summoned to work, a Deaconess may, if belonging to a Deaconess-Institution, act in harmony with the general rules of such institution." On these definitions and this statement of principles I say nothing at present in the way of criticism. I will only add that the paper acquired importance from the signatures of nineteen of our bishops; the two who have been removed by death, besides the Archbishop of Canterbury, being the Bishop of St. David's and the Bishop of Lichfield.

(iii.) This paper, however, obtained additional weight through the favourable manner of its reception in the same year by our Sister Church in America. I cannot help laying great stress on this fact, for religious ideas that take root in the United States are likely to have considerable influence on the future history of the world.

"Westward the course of Empire holds its way;"

and Bishop Berkeley's famous line certainly includes the empire of religious thought. It is enough to say that in that year a comprehensive report, "recognising," to use its own words, "the tested value of organisations of Christian women in prosecuting the work of Christ and His Church"—including, among other materials, the above mentioned paper—and recommending the immediate adoption of practical measures, was presented to the General Convention of that year at Baltimore, and that from that year onward this general view of the place of authorised female ministrations in the Church has been widely accepted in America.

(iv.) Another circumstance which marks, not only a progress of public opinion during recent years, but a quickened activity of mind in this direction during the present year, is the fact that the subject has had a prominent place in the diocesan conferences of the dioceses of Rochester, Peterborough, and Durham, while the correspondence and conversations which have surrounded these discussions show clearly that the question is widely viewed as very urgent.

(v.) But in this present year also our attention has been called, in connection with this question, to another occurrence across the Atlantic. In the Diocesan Synod of Montreal a canon has recently been adopted for the "setting apart by the bishop of the diocese of women of devout character and approved fitness for the work of a Deaconess." The details which follow are too long to quote; but they are very carefully drawn up, and they seem to me to be marked by practical good sense. Religious movements in the colonies are by no means to be despised. It may hereafter be found that they re-act with much benefit on the Mother Church at home.

(vi.) Nor in this slight survey of progress made during the last few years ought we to lose sight of another broad aspect of the subject. Our customary view of the general responsibilities, capabilities, and claims of women is not quite what it was in 1862. We recognise in them, more respectfully than we used to do, special capacities for service which could not be done equally well by men, and, co-ordinately with this, we recognise the duty of training them for such service. The establishment of schools for the higher education of women, the organising of the Girls' Friendly Society, the advancement made in the care of our hospitals and in provision for district-nursing, the removal of some prejudices regarding the dignity of remunerative employment for ladies who are not rich—these changes are indications of what I mean, and of what will be readily understood. The Deaconess-question may in fact be said, under one point of view, to be the religious side of a much larger question, affecting, under the conditions of modern social life, what King Alfred called "the spindle side of the house."

The facts which have been enumerated are sufficient to show that this subject is pressing upon us with some weight, and that it rightfully

demands our very careful attention. But now it seems proper to state more precisely what is intended by this word "Deaconess," what the thought is that underlies all this anxious desire for an organisation, which we do not possess at present except in a rudimentary form. Now the scheme, as it presents itself to me, is a very great and ambitious one. It is nothing less than an endeavour to restore to the Church what the Church has lost, what it was intended to have, what it did possess in the Primitive Age, and without which it is placed at a great disadvantage in the inevitable struggle against sin, ignorance, and sorrow. It seems to me that the modern state of society—with its separation of rich and poor, its intricate and delicate problems, its strain upon thought and feeling—needs quite as much as any previous age, perhaps more than any, an authorised and well-organised ministry of women.

It will be seen at once that this question is placed on strictly Church lines. It is a Church ministry, not a mere voluntary agency of any kind, which is demanded; and a great point is gained immediately by this mere statement of the case. All antagonism to anything else is put out of view. All opinions connected with other methods of female agency for religious and philanthropic ends remain just what they were before. The question ought to be viewed as having no entanglement with party, and as rising high above the mere fashion of the day. It is a Church question: and the Church will last longer than our parties and our fashions. Feminine agency may be crystallised into the exact form of Sisterhoods, or may be diluted into the free movement of District Visitors. These are not the precise inquiries before us. How much should be included under the Church Diaconate of women, what varieties of method under one system should be allowed, is a question not of principle but of detail. What we want is the thing itself—an authorised official Diaconate of women as an integral part of our Church system—a body of Deaconesses co-extensive with the Church itself, ready for service wherever they are needed—and the needs are very various—but appointed and directed by the bishops, and serving under the parochial clergy.

But, moreover, the system which is here advocated is on Bible lines as well as on Church lines; and, in fact, these two directions ought to be in strictest harmony with one another. It is an evil day when Church lines are not parallel with—or rather, I would say, not coincident with—Bible lines. Still there is this difference between the Ecclesiastical and the Scriptural aspects of such a subject, that the New Testament gives us principles rather than methods, whereas in practice we must arrange for definite methods. The Revised Version has rescued for us, out of most serious error, a clear statement of principle in this matter; and thus the publication of this Version might most correctly have been named as one of the recent facts that have tended to bring this whole subject into prominence. Every one knows now, what was known to exact Biblical scholars before, that in the third chapter of St. Paul's First Epistle to Timothy, when the Apostle is describing the qualifications of those who are fit to be appointed to the lower and higher ministries of the Church, he describes the qualifications of women fit for their place in one part of

such ministry. We need no longer perplex ourselves to find a reason why the wives of the Deacons should be admonished, whereas the wives of those who belong to a higher order receive none of that admonition which seems in their case to be equally requsite. We have in fact here in this eleventh verse the Man-Deacon and the Woman-Deacon co-ordinated side by side, in the same general ministry, just as we find to be the case afterwards in the post-Apostolic age.

It has been remarked by the Bishop of Durham in his Primary Charge that on Scriptural grounds Phœbe has quite as much right to be called a Deacon as has Stephen or Philip. But the case might with strict accuracy have been stated more strongly; for Stephen and Philip are nowhere designated by this term, whereas Phœbe is expressly so designated, while the nature of her work and her high responsibility are not obscurely indicated. It appears to me that if we take our stand simply on the ground of the New Testament, the argument for the recognition of Deaconesses as a part of the Christian ministry is as strong as the argument for Episcopacy. And if anything approaching to this assertion is true, then two conclusions appear to follow: first, it is a daring responsibility to attempt to carry on the work of the Church without the acknowledgment of this principle, and we must expect to suffer if we make the attempt; secondly, this mention of the ministerial appointment of women, where notices of the details of the Christian ministry are so scanty, gives a new significance to the high honour paid to women, and to their prominent position, throughout the New Testament.

Of the Female Diaconate in the early ages after the time of the Apostles I will only say this—and in a diocese which contains a University it is worth while to say it—that the study of this subject deserves a closer attention than it has yet received. Such study, in fact, seems to be imperative; for surely it is probable that what was best for the primitive times is best for our own; and the Church of England has always professed to seek for precedents in the early ages. As to the special topics which such an inquiry includes, they are such as these—How were the primitive Deaconesses appointed, and with what formalities? Did they ever live in community, or were they scattered and diffused, according to the exigencies that required them? What kind of work was assigned to them? In what relation did they stand to the Presbyterate and the Episcopate? This list of questions might easily be augmented. But I will only add this remark on the point immediately before us, that I am persuaded that such research into the primitive facts relating to the women who were Deacons will be pursued to greater advantage if they are combined with inquiries into all that relates to Deacons of the other sex. Some modern mistakes on this latter subject are very likely to lead us astray. Our present Deacons are not the deacons either of the Prayer Book or of the Primitive Church.

We may, however, in that investigation of this whole subject which seems at present to be incumbent upon us, become too scholastic, too exclusively historical. The special experience which is derived from the characteristics of our times must be very carefully taken into account. And here it is to be noted that those women ought to be invited into counsel who have been actually doing work of this kind,

while some of us have been speculating upon it. They may know much that we do not know. They may have observed many things which have escaped our notice. They may sometimes be better judges than we are of methods and details. Moreover, we must respectfully acknowledge their high devotion, and the claim they have established upon the gratitude of the Church. The woman's view of such a question as that which is before us cannot safely be neglected.

Yet there is another side of this part of our subject which must by no means be disregarded. Mere idle compliments, in such a discussion as this, would be impertinent and foolish. The best women are not always the wisest. Enthusiasm does not pause to calculate consequences; and the calculation of consequences is a serious duty in the handling of a delicate subject at a critical time. Mere preferences may be pushed to an extreme; and the responsibility of the harm which results may fall upon others, and involve them in the utmost difficulty :—

> "How much of all that human hearts endure
> Women can rashly cause and cannot cure."

And another respectful appeal may, I hope, with propriety be made to our bishops, that they take this subject into minute consideration, and manipulate it with a strong hand. It is of the essence of the very idea of the Deaconess-system that it is not voluntary but official, and subject in all its parts to the knowledge and control of the bishops. If a religious movement, associated with much zeal, is allowed to drift, it may assume harmful forms very difficult to correct. If usages grow up, and opinions become settled, which are out of harmony with our authorised standards of faith and practice, then peril to the Church must ensue. Above all, if esoteric understandings, not known to the Bishops, were to become secretly operative, that truthfulness, which is an essential part of holiness, would be, to say the least, in jeopardy. Even questions of costume and phraseology, in a matter of this kind, are of greater importance than at first sight appears.

In this paper I have endeavoured to limit myself to the statement of principles, avoiding mere details. Still there are two topics which some might view as belonging to the region of detail, and some to the region of principle, and which I beg leave to name before I conclude.

The relation of Deaconess-Institutions to dioceses is not altogether a simple and easy question. I assume that Deaconess-Institutions, more or less, must exist. Efficient training, both of religious character and in reference to future duties, is of the utmost moment. Moreover women, labouring in scattered places of work, often under very depressing circumstances, have need of a healthy bond of union to cheer them and strengthen them. Regarding the Deaconess-Institution of any one Diocese, it is easy and obvious to say that it should be in all particulars—including, for instance, the books which are used in it—under the close and direct supervision of its own bishop. But if a Deaconess, originally belonging to the Institution of one diocese, is called to work in another diocese, then some questions arise, which are not altogether free from difficulty. They are, in fact, parts of a larger question—viz., this, how, in the process of recovering the Diaconate of Women, provision is to be made for a good understanding among

different dioceses, as to both principles and methods. As to the particular point which has led to this general remark, I will only add that though I regard the distributed work of Deaconesses in parishes as the main subject with which we have to do, yet to each such "servant of the Church" the possession of a home, to which she can return in case of failing health or great discouragement, is likely to be a treasure of great price.

The other topic, which I have reserved to the last, may be indicated under various forms of expression. Is this office of the Female Diaconate an office for life? Are such orders, if orders they are to be called, indelible? Are life-vows to be admitted, or to be required? and should such vows so far differ from the obligations of the diaconate of men, as to preclude the possibility of marriage? I purposely throughout this paper put the Diaconate of men and women side by side: for so they are placed, alike by St. Paul and in the records of the earlier Christian ages. As to the tenure of the office of a Deaconess, I certainly think that a woman presenting herself for the service ought to view it as a life-service. But the question of vows takes us to different ground. We cannot penetrate the secrets of any heart, whether those secrets be wise or unwise. But as to official vows, given by authority, and revoked by authority, I confess I do not see where any power to this effect resides. I observe that bishops are very reluctant to assume that they have any such power; and if anyone less than a bishop assumes that he has it, may it not be possible that he is deluded?

But, moreover, there remains the question whether such vows elevate the office or bring it down to a lower level. Here, however, I would rather use the words of another than my own. That question was definitely before us at that earlier meeting of the Church Congress in this diocese; and Bishop Wilberforce, at the close of the meeting, said very seriously regarding vows of celibacy, made for life, or even for a limited period, that "as holding the office which God had given him, he could not take part in the arrangements of any institution in which such vows formed a part." He wished that there should be "no mistake" on this subject, and he gave three definite reasons, as follows:—"First," he said, "I see no warrant for such vows in the Word of God; and it would seem to me that to encourage persons to make vows for which there is no distinct promise given that they should be able to keep them, would be entangling them in a yoke of danger. Secondly, it seems to me that our Church has certainly discouraged such vows. And, thirdly, it seems to me really to be of the essence of such a religious life that it should be continued, not because in a moment of past fervour a vow was made, but because by a continued life of love that life is again and again freely offered to that service to which it was definitely dedicated." He added that "instead of perpetual vows representing the higher, it was the admission of a lower standard;" and he said further, that "he had the deepest objection, in any way whatever, to apply the technical term 'religious' to such a life."

Those who were present on the occasion will remember the earnestness of tone with which these words were spoken. Nor is there any reason, so far as I am aware, for believing that Bishop Wilberforce ever changed his mind on the subject. Five years later he expressed the same

opinion with equal strength. His memory will secure, from this audience at least, a respectful consideration of his deliberate utterance on this part of the subject; and incidents have not been wanting since, which add to what he then said the force of very grave experience.

ADDRESSES.

(*c*) District Visitors.

Dr. Acland, F.R.S., Regius Professor of Medicine, Oxford.

In the remarks which I venture to make in obedience to the desire of your committee, I shall confine myself entirely to that portion of "District Visiting," which is concerned with the medical care of the poor by women. In this I do not allude to the case of women who have had complete education as medical practitioners, though I note with full approval the high and complete training of exceptional women for special purposes in the medical profession. As a national duty, I have done all in my power for some years to promote thorough education of women for the purpose of medical and surgical practice among the hundred millions of women of India. But this education is wholly different from that of which I now have to speak, the Education and Training of District Nurses. A typical nurse is a person possessing special qualities, both intellectual and moral. Miss Nightingale in her strong graphic way puts it, that, as regards character, she "should illustrate the Sermon on the Mount."

She has quick powers of observation, with full knowledge of what and how to observe; powers of physical endurance; quiet cheerfulness under all circumstances; an imperturbable self-control; and the gift of absolute obedience to the physician and surgeon, combined with readiness to take personal responsibility. All this is so obvious that it needs no comment from me. As a matter of fact, many here have repeatedly seen persons thus gifted and so devoted, ready at any moment continuously to give all their powers to the meanest stranger, remembering the words, "I was sick and ye visited Me." This being so as to personal character of nurses, what are the chief heads of the subject?

I. Training District Nurses; and

II. Administering a local system of District Nursing.

I. *As to Training a District Nurse.*

1. *She must have been trained as a Hospital Nurse*, in a hospital suitable to the purpose. She must have been trained also to be a *District* Nurse; observe the difference. A good hospital is a place where everything from the foundation to the roof is prepared for the express care of sick persons. You may thus very properly ask at a good hospital to be shown the best ventilator or fire-place, mattress or bath, filters, disinfector, trap, or sewer, the best and cheapest cooking recipes, and drinks, as well as instruments, bandages, and appliances. All these, therefore, the hospital nurse has always at hand; she is surrounded by them. But the *District* Nurse may be suddenly sent to a bad case in a house where everything is ill-arranged for health from foundation to roof, with no adequate light, nor air, nor warmth, nor bedding; only hoarded filth, and not a single appliance suitable for real illness, and no food; and, except a poor neighbour, no help. What must then be her actual training?

As a hospital nurse, Miss Nightingale has written largely on this matter, and has reduced the rules for a nurse's education to a complete system. It is

practically in operation in many places, more or less perfectly. The model is to be found at St. Thomas's Hospital. There you can learn exactly the extent to which the education is carried, the precise subjects of lectures, and the time which their courses take. A woman of intelligence and zeal can but have the greatest delight in them. But they are numerous and detailed. For instance, at St. Thomas's, there are lectures on anatomy, surgery, medicine, chemistry, given by Dr. Bristowe, Mr. Croft and Dr. Bernays. The practical instruction in the Wards includes all the following subjects:—1. The surroundings and ventilation of the sick room. The regulation of the temperature and moisture under various conditions. The arrangement of light, cleanliness of walls, floors, bed, utensils, furniture, disinfecting, personal care, care of instruments. 2. Management of diet, and feeding. 3. Application of remedies, as use of certain instruments, moving patients, cleaning and washing. Making bed without fatigue, and preparing it for various operations. Attending operations. Bandaging, splints, subcutaneous injections, inhalations and spray. Antiseptic methods. Recording temperature, and other particulars on charts. It has to be noted that the teaching these several subjects in the wards of a great hospital has again to be subdivided. The probationers in St. Thomas's are systematically taken through both male and female wards in the several classes of cases, medical, surgical, ophthalmic, obstetric and Magdalen. The least time that is required is twelve months, and you will think that little enough for all that has been named.

2. *She must be trained in a District.* The District Nurse, so prepared as a hospital nurse, is to be instructed in the district work conducted under difficulties. She finds too often a room wholly unfit, and a mass of filth, which I forbear here to describe. The first thing is to cleanse it, remove what is removable and useless, wash the floor, clean the grate, make the bed, if there be one—in fact, re-form, create a home. There is then a hope that the personal care of perhaps a bed-ridden sufferer can be entered upon with chance of alleviation. These scenes must be visited to be believed. They are known to the parochial clergy through the length and breadth of the land. To them they cannot be exaggerated. Many of them know the blessing of a nurse, who, trained in a hospital, proceeds to the work which I have so briefly described. They probably will endorse my conviction that where women of education undertake it, in the spirit which I described at first, they are the fittest and most acceptable for the beneficent work. This is found to be the case in Mrs. Craven's Association in Bloomsbury Square, where the system is fully organised, and has been for years in operation.

II. *As to administering a local system of District Nursing.* A few general propositions which have to be borne in mind in arranging and carrying on an institution for District Nursing I add: 1. In arranging a system of District Nurses a home is required for the residence of the nurses or nurse. This may be provided on various scales of expenditure. In London the Bloomsbury Square Home, with its twelve resident ladies, and a superintendent, is a considerable house. In a country parish the home for one nurse may often be contrived in the house of a sympathetic parishioner. 2. There must be a superintendent. She may be a trained nurse, should be so if possible; and in a complete institution is so. But in many country districts a lady can often be found to give much of the required management. In the former case the superintendent sees every case at the first, and periodically with each district nurse. 3. The nurses cannot visit infectious, general, and midwifery cases simultaneously. Therefore, it is not possible to get in a country parish from *one* nurse the full help that may be desired. 4. It is the opinion of those most experienced in this matter that the nurses must

scrupulously refrain from acting as almsgivers, either in money or kind. 5. They should be in friendly relations with all local Government officers, and with visitors and ministers of all denominations. To these they communicate wants they cannot supply. They furnish linen, nursery appliances, and sometimes washing. 6. They should never take charge of any case which is not under the care of a regular medical practitioner. 7. Those who watch the needs of the sick poor should promote united action between district nursing, dispensaries, and hospitals. These relations are receiving, and demand, much consideration through the whole country. In many districts it is desirable to revise the conditions under which the sick poor are made in-patients at hospitals or are nursed at their own homes. Lastly, I may be permitted to say that this kind of trained nursing is one well worth the attention of the women of England. There are thousands of women as willing as able to undertake it, in one form or another. The parochial system of our country is splendidly adapted to promote a work so necessary in an order of things which an increasing population assuredly aggravates, an order in which sickness and suffering are, although incurable, yet capable in part of prevention, and when not preventible, of alleviation.

(*d*) Mission Women.

J. G. Talbot, Esq., M.P., D.C.L.

I feel some satisfaction this morning in the sensation that I am addressing an audience composed very largely of ladies. The peculiar features of this morning's arrangements have necessitated the absence of a great number of men from this hall, and the presence of a great number of ladies here; and the subject which I have undertaken to bring before the notice of the Congress is one which is peculiarly suited for the consideration of ladies. It is a work entirely—if I may say so—in the hands of women. It is a work which in its first inception was undertaken by women. It is a work of which the organisation is now entirely in the hands of women. It is a work of which the ministrants are women, and it is a work which is carried on for the benefit of women. I hope, at least, therefore, that to that part of the Congress who are represented in large numbers this morning, my few remarks may be of some interest. I think what the organisation of the Parochial Mission Women's Fund does is this: it gives an opportunity for developing that which is at any rate one of the chief virtues of the poor, namely, their determination to help one another to the best of their ability in any distress, and in this way it gives an opening for the energies of the poor in devotion to the work of the Church. I think it would be a very great mischief if we were to put the work of Parochial Mission Women in any rivalry with the work of Sisters, Deaconesses, Nurses, or District Visitors, of whom we have been speaking here this morning. But if the female work of the Church were entirely confined to these, then it is obvious that there would be no room for the work of those who cannot afford to work without pay. They then would be simply the recipients of mercy and charity, and never be givers of it. But by this organisation the poor women themselves are made to be the ministrants of the Church. The money given to the Parochial Mission Women in the shape of wages, is merely such money as enables them to live decently—not such money as will attract them from other works, or anything in the nature of a high salary for persons in their rank of life. May I tell those who do not know how this work first

began? There was a book written, probably known to many here present, called the *Missing Link*, and published, I think, about 25 years ago by a lady named Mrs. Ranyard. In that book an account was given of what are called Bible Women; and the *Missing Link* meant that this work was intended to reach a class of people, who could not otherwise be reached, by the employment of poor women to minister to the poor. Some ladies—some of them very closely related to myself, and that is my best apology for appearing here this morning to speak on this subject—some ladies, devoted members of the Church of England, thought it would be a shame and disgrace to the Church if this work was to be left to other organisations outside the Church, and there was no reason whatever why the same work should not be done on strictly Church lines, and they organised the Parochial Mission Women Fund to be an organisation of Church Bible Women. The Mission Woman herself was a poor woman, used to the ordinary hardships and difficulties of a wife and mother in the class to which she belonged. To give an illustration of her work, I may mention that she has every day a number of poor women to call upon, in order to collect from them pence and halfpence for the purpose of clothing. This gives her the entrance to many rooms which would be closed against her or any other visitor. She receives the money from these people, and the money so collected is kept for them and used in the purchase of articles which they require. To give you an idea of the amount which is so collected by the Mission Women from the poor for themselves, I may mention that the total amount of savings collected by the Mission Women from the poor in 23 years ending 1882, mostly in pence and halfpence, was no less a sum than £217,000. And in the year 1882 alone, the total sum collected amounted to £14,000. This money is entirely collected in small sums, which would inevitably be wasted, because the people from whom this money is collected are people of the very lowest sort—people, I mean, living in unfortunately neglected and degraded homes—and this money is returned to the people in kind. They become, by means of this money, the possessors of articles of clothing, of articles of furniture, which they would not otherwise have obtained, and their homes to that extent are made more decent and comfortable. But that is by no means all that happens. That is but the fringe of the work which they do: the other statistics of their work is much harder to put into the mere language of results. But such things as these are done by their means: they are instrumental in bringing children to Baptism; they are instrumental in inducing persons living in sin to be married; they are instrumental in bringing to the notice of the parochial clergy those persons who would otherwise be outside their ministrations; and many such poor women, by means of the parochial mission, have become regular attendants at Church, and communicants there. But possibly the best testimony which can be given in support of such work is, the determination on the part of the clergy, I think I may say, without exception, of those who have tried this agency, never to part with it; and frequently applications are received from clergymen who have had one such Mission Woman to have more. This agency is strictly a Church agency; it proceeds absolutely upon the lines of the Church system. No Mission Women can be appointed without an application from a parochial clergyman, nor, indeed, without his selection. Perhaps I may add something more interesting than general statements—an extract from the report of one of the lady superintendents of one of these missions in a large seaport town, which will give some idea of the work done by this agency. The Lady Superintendent says:—"We have not had to mourn one instance of inconsistency amongst our communicant mothers, and no less than 25 men have been brought to the house of God through the mothers' meeting. Two of the men who were confirmed have been drunkards, and one of them bitterly persecuted his wife for the stand she made for God. For

months that woman never went to church that she had not to endure the most cruel taunts, and to see him turn into a beershop, saying, 'Well, you go your way, and I go mine.' Through God's blessing he is now a total abstainer, and I believe a really God-fearing man. . . . The Mission Woman's work is thoroughly appreciated. After the tea, this year, the mothers presented her with a teapot; they did not ask us to subscribe, as they said they wanted to do it entirely from themselves. They look on her as a tried and trusted friend. . . . I was much amused when the clergyman who has lately come to take charge of the Mission district said to me, 'I object rather to your meetings for one thing, instead of the lower class of women whom we want to reach, you have got the pick of the district.' When I told him the women were most of them wives of brickmakers, charwomen, or earning their bread by staymaking, he was much surprised, and he was still more astonished when he heard that among them were two who were living in sin with the men to whom they are now married; many had been blasphemers; few, if any, had ever entered a place of worship, or had their children baptized. We had not even one communicant when we began; some had been a terror to the streets in which they lived from their violence, and we have several reformed drunkards. I added, 'If you still think we are too respectable, I hope soon to have in the meeting two women who have lived by keeping bad houses, and two who have themselves been inmates of such houses." I trust I have established my point, that these people minister to the very lowest class of the population—a class which, so far as we know, has not been reached by other agencies. And now, in conclusion, let me ask, lest anyone who may have been impressed with what they have heard this morning, and who may be inclined to think how such an agency could be established in their own parishes, and how they could appoint a Parochial Mission Woman, what is the cost in each case. It is so small, that it is difficult to believe that the necessary funds would not be forthcoming if the value of the agency were known. £35 a year, or in a few cases a little more, would secure these two invaluable friends for a poor district, that is, the paid Mission Woman, who will receive perhaps 12s. or 13s. a week, and the unpaid Lady Superintendent, who in many cases gives the greater portion of her time to this work. I may also mention that in the east, and in the remoter districts of London, it is sometimes difficult to find a lady of superior position for the work; but then a lady from the West End is often found to superintend the work of the Mission Woman in the poor district. I feel it is impossible in a quarter of an hour to give an adequate account of the real work done by such an agency as this; but I should be quite content if what I have said now will be sufficient to induce anyone to apply for further information on this subject. I would just mention that the office of the society is No. 11, Buckingham Street, Strand, and if anyone will apply there for any information on this subject, it will be gladly given.

DISCUSSION.

The Ven. W. EMERY, Archdeacon and Canon of Ely; and Permanent Secretary to Church Congresses.

IF any proof were wanted of the effect of Church Congresses in promoting toleration of the expression of divergent views, and in practically drawing together in united action those who on some points differ widely, that proof has been given to-day. Let those who remember what took place at the Oxford Church Congress in 1862 compare it with what has taken place to-day, with the same subject and the same reader, and

it will be acknowledged that with all our unfortunate divergences and differences, which still exist and trouble us, the growth of charity and readiness calmly and lovingly to consider what each side deems right and wise in practice, have been greatly advanced by Congress and like discussions and gatherings during the last twenty-one years. Having said thus much in view of what has been read and spoken this morning, I wish to speak in the name of a lady for the few minutes allotted me rather than in my own name. We have had four classes of ministering work spoken of, but there is one portion of that work which must come, directly or indirectly, into all the classes, namely, religious teaching. It is quite impossible to ignore the fact that whatever be their designation—Sisters, Deaconesses, Mission Women, or Nurses—they must be teaching women, and both by word and example they may do a great deal of harm, as well as good, unless they are properly instructed and trained to teach. We have heard from Dr. Acland the value of the training of nurses, and we have had mention made of Florence Nightingale, who set such a noble example of the self-devotion of woman to the nursing of the sick. Now it is acknowledged that to secure good nurses you must have them well-trained, and therefore I come to the question as to what should be the education of women and their religious teaching in the duties undertaken by them. If we are to have our religious ministering women do the best service for God and His Church, they should also to some extent, and as far as possible, be trained in religious teaching. This is one branch of Woman's Work which Miss Beale, the successful head of the Ladies' College at Cheltenham, thinks has been neglected, and she pleads for the training of women for giving religious instruction. She thinks that this is a training which requires—no less than that of nurses—a prolonged education, and she gives hints in a paper which I hold in my hand as to how that education could be obtained. I will try to put them before you. "Might there not be," she says, "a great extension of Church teaching by women whose work should meet with some form of recognition in the Church. The S. P. G. is enrolling women among its missionaries, and so are other religious societies. The question is why should not the Church accept women in this country distinctly as teachers under episcopal sanction. The demands of an evergrowing population are very great, and the clergy, it is believed, would welcome help in the way of Biblical instruction if it came from properly and well-trained ministering women. That there is a need for a great extension of systematic religious teaching amongst women is painfully evident to those who have the management of schools." What is the Sunday instruction? "We know," says the lady, "it is impossible for the clergy to give from the pulpit any systematic teaching." I do not agree with her here. But I agree with this—and it is most important—that there should be some good systematic teaching at home, and that the young women who become mothers should have some systematic religious teaching after their confirmation. Very often the religious teaching of our young women ceases after confirmation, and Miss Beale urges that the clergy and the Church should take some pains to provide classes for the systematic instruction of our young women after confirmation, so that they might be prepared against the attacks "of the unbeliever or the Romanist." The style of religious examinations at the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge, in past years, she considers faulty, because the examinations have been in the technical knowledge of the Scriptures and not in its deep truths. At Oxford at least this defect, it is stated, will in future be guarded against. There has been an enormous opportunity of study in all other departments, says this lady, in language, in literature, and in science, and she thinks there ought to be further opportunities for instruction in religion. She suggests, therefore, that it would be very desirable to have a system inaugurated by the Church and the clergy of giving examination papers to any women who would be willing to take them, and that there should be some system of correcting the answers, and of giving instruction on the subjects. She thinks that sufficiently numerous classes might be held in different towns where such instruction might be given. There are large numbers of pupil teachers from Board and Church Schools, who cannot go to training colleges, who need instruction, which the mistress is too overwhelmed to give, and so she urges that ladies should come forward and give themselves to this work, and take classes of these pupil teachers and others. But then these ladies themselves must be instructed, and therefore you must first teach the teachers. Why should not many churchwomen be like Tryphena and Tryphosa, who merited the title of helpers of the apostle, for whom not only he gave thanks, but the Churches also. "I rejoice," says the writer of the paper of which I have tried, imperfectly, I fear, to convey the substance, "in knowing that the subject is occupying the earnest attention of those whom God has placed over us in His Church, and especially of him who has been called to the primacy. Some of the most immediate means which occur to

me are to unite arrangements for an extension of religious instruction classes for adults—care being taken to classify students, as is done in teaching all other subjects. There should also be catechetical instruction and written work, so that students may not always be passive. I would suggest that immediate steps be taken for forming a body of qualified teachers to whom the clergy may have recourse for assistance, and I believe this would lead eventually to the establishment of some regular school for training women as religious teachers. In the meantime, much could be done in the way of helping those who have leisure and zeal, but who need knowledge and guidance. The experiment that has been tried of giving to lay readers one month of training and instruction at Keble College (and the like, I may add, at Selwyn this year) during the vacation has been very successful. Many women teaching in schools would welcome such an opportunity as might be afforded by a course of a few weeks of quiet study and instruction at such a centre as Oxford. I believe that heads of the colleges for women would grant facilities for residence, and men of ability in the Church would be found to sacrifice some of their rest to such a cause. Even a few quiet days, such as were provided by the Bishop of Truro at Christmas, 1882, at St. Peter's, were much appreciated by a large body of teachers, and even three days of systematic teaching and of continuous thought, uninterrupted by conversation, represent a good deal of valuable work, and may be made the beginning of a course of real study." Thus, in the words chiefly of one who deserves to be heard on this subject, I have ventured to press this branch of Woman's Work on the attention of the Congress as well worthy of distinct consideration, believing that we might train up in the ways suggested an army of religious women, acting under different names, who would do, not only great good by their enthusiastic piety, but still greater good by being thoroughly instructed in religious knowledge.

The Right Hon. Earl Nelson.

I sent in my card for the purpose of speaking in reference to Sisterhoods, but I would begin by remarking, that there is no opposition in the various phases of Women's Work mentioned in our paper. Sisters are deaconesses, are district visitors, are district nurses, are mission women; and our Sisters would willingly give the right hand of fellowship to diocesan bodies of deaconesses, wherever such can be formed; and do help to raise and improve all the other branches of Women's Work, and are ever willing to instruct others in the best means of performing it, from the experience which their organised special aims gives them. But Sisterhoods are the most wonderful of our wonderful works that have grown up from our Church revival of the last fifty years; and they grew up without any support from the heads of the Church, against every possible discouragement and misconception, and yet though left to the management of women (against whose discretion and judgment one of the previous speakers has taken exception) with wonderfully few mistakes. Who has not heard of the Sisters of East Grinstead, and the aid they have given in raising the work of nursing the sick through the length and breadth of our land. I was staying at a place in Devonshire, where a poor woman of the parish was laid low of an infectious fever, and the local nurses and neighbours had left her in alarm. A Sister arrived from East Grinstead, in answer to a telegram, refused any refreshment at the Manor House, after her long journey, but went at once to the infected cottage to nurse the poor sufferer, partaking of the humble fare of the labourer's cottage? Who has not heard of the Sisters of Clewer, and the wonderful power they have brought to bear on all penitentiary work, for which as a general rule in times gone by, female agency was seldom employed? Who has not heard of the Sisters of the Church at Kilburn, and their labours in all branches of work for the extension of the Church, and who have honoured me by asking me to be their president? But I am certain that these works could not have been carried on if these different communities were shackled beyond their own rules, by a lay council. Is it to be supposed for a moment, that the great ventures of faith at the Broadstairs Convalescent Home, and the new wing of the Orphanage at Kilburn, would have been sanctioned by a committee, or even by the president, if asked as a practical man if the thing was feasible or wise, and yet they will both be, by God's blessing, undoubtedly accomplished. There are three objections, well nigh obsolete, that have been made to Sisterhoods. 1. The question of vows; and yet the Dean of Chester agrees with

Canon Carter, that it ought to be a life-long work; and by a system of vows for short periods, to be renewed, or an arrangement for dispensation in the original vow, all the supposed evils would be removed; for no one seriously wishes to keep people to the work when they are unfitted, or clearly have, from altered circumstances, more decided calls. 2nd. As to the neglect of their families. This is practically of rare occurrence. Who does not find many families now who look upon it as a rightful vocation for women, and rejoice that one of their number has joined a Sisterhood; and though many can and do do useful work at home, there are many who (without being 60) have given up all idea of marriage, and long for systematic organised work for Christ. I must give you the opinion of a Guardsman who was travelling with me on my way to the Congress. On hearing the account of my good Sisters' works for the sick and the orphan, he exclaimed—"Those are just the people who ought to be the future mothers for our children." And when told that they had not that calling, he declared that every young lady who looked to marriage, would be all the better fitted for future duties by a three year's training in such a sisterhood.

The Rev. BERDMORE COMPTON, Vicar of All Saints', Margaret Street, W.

THERE is more difference than Earl Nelson charitably assumes between the life-vows approved by Mr. Carter, and the life-service advocated by the Dean of Chester; and the difference involves the whole question of vows. But, perhaps, it is altogether too late to discuss this question. We have heard quoted the strong language of Bishop Wilberforce against life-vows twenty-one years ago. We know that they are practically, almost universally, prevalent in our Sisterhoods at this time. If the voice of the great bishop was ineffectual then against the principle, whose words will be likely to avail now against the logic of facts? But, in accepting the practice of life-vows as established in our Sisterhoods, there is yet time, as there is much need, to regulate them. If Bishop Wilberforce were yet among us, he would probably tell us that what was not ripe twenty-one years ago, is ripe now for acceptance and regulation. Nothing is worse than vagueness in vows. And taking the three vows of celibacy, poverty, and obedience, there is great vagueness about the two latter. No one needs a definition of celibacy. It admits of no degrees. But poverty and obedience are comparative. No one in a community supposed a vow of poverty to imply absolute destitution; nor a vow of obedience to involve absolute personal slavery, independent of all law and rule. Above these abysses there are many degrees of poverty and obedience. These two vows require definition by authority. And it is time that the authorities of the Church should define them. It is hopeless, as it is dangerous, to delay any longer the recognition of the practice of vows, and thus to suffer them to crystallise irregularly and injuriously to defenceless women. As to terminable vows, I speak with some experience, when I say that they are a great failure. They produce a revolutionary crisis in a Sister's life every three or five years, which upsets them for a considerable time. Only imagine the result of the clergy taking terminable vows! The formidable question at every renewal—"Shall I go on, or not?" As to the government of Sisterhoods, I urgently suggest that they should be diocesan, not parochial, much less private, institutions; and that they should be under the immediate control of the bishop of the diocese. Mr. Carter objects strongly, and most rightly, to the interference of a board or committee, with the private life of the Sisters; and it may be said that the bishops of our enormous dioceses have such a burden of work upon them that it would be impossible for them to exercise direct personal superintendence over the inner life of a diocesan Sisterhood, and that they can only govern by deputy, by something analogous to the objectionable means of a board or committee. I can only reply, that if our dioceses are too large for the bishops to work them properly, they ought to be divided. Of course, there is some advantage in a system of large mother-houses, large enough to extend their operations over several dioceses, inasmuch as they can more easily devote their individual members to the special departments of Women's Work for which they are individually most fitted. But will it not follow that the heads of such gigantic mother-houses will be almost in the pitiable condition of the bishops of our gigantic dioceses, obliged to govern by deputy, with the burden, though not the dignity, of

veritable mitred abbesses! At all events, the bishop should somehow be responsible to the Church, and to the head of the Church, for the government of a diocesan religious home. And how is he to exercise this responsibility without practical knowledge of the individual inner life of the Sisters? At present there is infinite danger in a vague responsibility, shared indefinitely between the bishop, the chaplain of the community, and the mother superior. Lastly, there is a department of Women's Work which has not been adverted to in this debate, viz., the work of a woman trained in a community, and commissioned as a deaconess of the Catholic Church by a bishop, but who has never belonged to a community, and who works as a deaconess, independently of any such institution. Of this kind of work, you have an excellent example here in Reading. Deaconess Cordelia Hart, in the position here stated, has for some years conducted the penitentiary work of St. Mary's Home in this town, with a perseverance and success which ought to be better known than it is, and which exhibits in a very favourable light this special form of Woman's Work in the Church Catholic.

The Lord Bishop of Meath.

It may perhaps enliven my remarks, which otherwise might be somewhat dull, if I venture to tell a story to this meeting—a story of real life, for the truth of which I can vouch, and which I believe to be relevant to the subject now before us. Some twenty-five years ago, a young unmarried lady, with whom I have since had the pleasure of becoming somewhat intimately acquainted, in the city of Dublin, was requested by a lady friend to read that interesting book which has been just referred to—"The Missing Link." This lady had been in the habit of threading her way through that poverty-stricken part of Dublin which is known as "The Liberties," around the ancient cathedral of St. Patrick, and she felt very desirous that some work might be done there, similar to that which had been so happily begun in London. A relation had lately left her a legacy of £25, with which to buy a ring, or otherwise dispose of as she might desire, and she appropriated this money to the payment of a salary to a Bible-woman. This Bible-woman was sent to the poor women in the neighbourhood, to tell them that there was a lady who would be glad to meet them at an afternoon tea, and to speak to them some words of counsel and instruction. When the time came to see these poor women collected together, this lady, as she afterwards told me, was very nervous, and so great was her trepidation, that she would not allow her lady friend to enter the room. Even the Bible-woman was excluded. At last, however, she summoned up courage enough to address these formidable old women, and she expounded to them the 23rd Psalm. They joined together in prayer, and finally the Bible-woman was admitted. There was then another prayer, and the proceedings came to an end. Thus was initiated the first effort in the way of a mothers' meeting in that part of Dublin. That was about twenty-five years ago; and since that time, this little beginning has developed into the form of a society, in connection with which there are now five mothers' meetings, attended by some five hundred poor women. There are also, in connection with this same work, some one hundred ladies—or I would rather use a larger, nobler word, and say some one hundred women. Time would fail me to mention all the departments of work—such as district visiting, temperance societies, Dorcas classes, industrial exhibitions, and many such like agencies—in which these ladies are engaged. But there is one department in particular to which I wish to refer. Some of you may have read a deeply-interesting work upon the subject of "Cathedrals," by our present Archbishop of Canterbury. He in that work refers to "the supply of large quantities of warm clothing" for the poor that were distributed by the Canons of Lincoln Cathedral in the olden time, and the "Dispensary," the "medicine niches" of which still surround the walls of the cathedral. And then he enumerates the works which, he says, "when our Church at large awakes to grander views of duty to all classes," he hopes that "the cathedrals may be the first to inaugurate," and he classes amongst them "organised charitable work in Hospital Service," saying that "Trained lady nurses with their staff are the very angels of sick men," and adding, "Is it a hopeless vision that the shadow of minster towers passing round day by day might have some healing within its circle, some spiritual provision for those days of languor when the rudest are impressionable, and for those rare weeks of

leisure." I am sorry that his Grace is not present, for, if he were, I should much like to inform him that his vision is now realised in the case of the ancient Cathedral of St. Patrick, in my own native city. In connection with that cathedral there is now a Nurse's Home, from which nurses go to visit the sick poor in their own houses, and this institution forms a part of that Charity of which I have been just speaking. While referring to St. Patrick's Cathedral, may I add that the result of this work has been that there is now in that cathedral every week a mission service, held in the Ladies' Chapel, where the poor specially attend, and that twice in the week there is an early administration of Holy Communion in that cathedral, which is also attended by the very poor. This is, I think, a great result to have followed from a small beginning, and I vouch for the truth of it, because I have had the privilege of being for many years the president of the committee under which the society is managed. And as regards the lady of whom I have spoken, without entering into the vexed question of the merits of the vows of celibacy, I may mention that this lady at least did not take upon herself those vows, inasmuch as for the last twenty years she has occupied the position of my wife. In conclusion, I wish to make one or two remarks upon these facts with which I have made you acquainted. First, I hope you will not attribute it to any spirit of boastfulness, if as an Irish Churchman I feel a justifiable pride in telling this meeting that our poor Church, in a time of great difficulty and great poverty, has not forgotten the Lord's command to "remember the poor." But, secondly, I would call attention to the fact that in this movement which I have described, we have those advantages which have been claimed by former speakers for Sisterhoods. We have an organised society; we have that "union" which undoubtedly is "strength;" we have ladies who are indeed consecrating themselves to a lifelong service; we have the poor visited, and the sick nursed, in the unhealthy alleys of a great city. But we have all this done without these ladies having taken upon themselves any vows, or having entered any Sisterhood. They are, no doubt, in very truth sisters, veritable sisters, of mercy, but I would venture to say that they are sisters who embody within their work all the advantages, without what I must honestly describe—for we must be honest if we are to speak at all—as the dangers of the conventual system. I would, lastly, just say to those ladies whom I see in such numbers before me, that they should take encouragement from this story that I have told them; and if there be any lady here who does not feel inclined to take upon herself vows, or to enter into a Sisterhood, at least let her find out and do the work which is close at hand. Why should she not make some sacrifice, and begin by employing the services of a Bible-woman, and by venturing to address even so formidable an audience as five or six old women? No one knows what such a beginning might in the end lead to. One of the speakers who has already addressed you has said that the Sisters who enter a Sisterhood do not love their homes the less, but Christ the more. Let me say to any of you who desire to work for Christ, without at the same time leaving your homes, Stay there, and by remaining in your homes you will love your homes the more, and will therefore love Christ the more too; and let me add, you will not, I am very sure, work for Him the less!

The Ven. JOHN LIONEL DARBY, Archdeacon of Chester.

I WOULD not have ventured to speak, even for five minutes, to the Congress, if I had not been chaplain to a Deaconesses Institution for seven years. And I cannot but think that the experience of twenty-one years, which has been spoken of here, and the different manner in which this question is treated to what it was twenty-four years ago, is not merely a matter of congratulation, but a great sign that the Church is realising more and more the deep meaning of the motto under which we find ourselves called together to-day, and which is before my eyes now. It is certain that we are all influenced by a unity of purpose, in aiding the restoration of Women's Work in the Church of God. None of us have a doubt that we need it. And, as the Bishop of Meath said, no one should speak unless they speak with perfect courage, I am going to be very bold indeed. Although it may apparently be a small matter, it is, I think, rather bold to stand up here for a moment, to express disagreement with so great an authority as the Bishop of Durham, and so excellent an authority as the Dean of Chester. I think that both those great authorities, if they will consider for a moment, will see that they may have somewhat over-strained the use of the word,

διάκονον in immediate connection with Phœbe. I cannot believe that it is certain St. Paul was describing her as a member of a distinct and divinely recognised order in the Church, for if we were to press a single word in that way, we might press a word which St. Paul used about himself, so as to mean that he was a deacon of the Church. While I venture so far to disagree, if they will allow me to associate myself with them, I would say that neither can be more anxions than I am to see the Deaconess movement thoroughly organised by the Church of England at large. There should be a Deaconess's Institution in every diocese in England, and, I would venture also to add, under the immediate control of the bishop of the diocese. The responsibility ultimately must rest upon someone in such an organisation as this; and while I heartily agree with Canon Carter, that the work of these devoted women must not be interfered with by committees and councils, I believe they will welcome and rejoice to receive the fatherly care of the bishop of the diocese, and I do not for one moment grant that, large as our dioceses are, the bishop will not find time to give all the care and attention which is necessary to direct a diocesan Deaconess Institution. For you must remember—if you will allow me to say so—that in some cases there will be found chaplains sensible enough not to refer every item of detail to the bishop, but only go to the bishop for instruction when great and broad principles are involved. And, judging from my own experience, I should say this, that I have never gone to the Bishop of Chester to consult him upon a broad principle without his giving wise counsel, which I did well to follow, and to his direction I do implicitly bow. Something has been said about there not being material to be found in the Church of England for Deaconesses Institutions. I beg leave to doubt that. Of course, it is a broad fact that Deaconesses Institutions are not filled by inmates as well as the Sisterhoods are. But it is not the want of material that has caused this, but because hitherto the deaconess' movement has been taken up in a desultory manner, and you cannot expect a work involving a life's devotion to be so treated, and yet to secure the best material. Now, on the right hand, and on the left, we have women anxious to devote themselves to active and organised work within the lines of the Church of England. I think the time has come, and I think that the harvest is ripe, but we must bear in mind that Deaconess Institutions cannot be prepared with fit inmates unless a very much larger effort of the Church is made in each diocese to provide funds for their maintenance. Some women, at this moment, to my own knowlege, are desirous of coming to our Deaconess Institutions, but have not the money to provide for even the two years' probation. And, with regard to that time, Canon Carter has gone far to smooth our difficulties as to the difference between vows and life service. If the bishops have the power and the authority to allow a Deaconess under certain special circumstances to lay down her commission—about which I do not intend now to argue, for that must be left in the hands of our chief pastors to decide—but this, I think, we may recognise, that the time of probation ought to last until a woman is at least thirty. I do not think there is danger in asking any young persons, zealous and energetic as they are, to give themselves in the solemn manner which they do at the London Diocesan Deaconesses Institution, to a life service without a longer probation than for two years. I should welcome them as probationers, even as young as eighteen, if perfectly free to retreat, and only put to certain descriptions of work. But they should not be entirely set apart until they were at least thirty years of age. There is one other point which has been touched upon, which, I think, partly accounts for our not having the best fitted material already in our Deaconess Institutions, and that is the point which Archdeacon Emery has touched upon, viz., religious training. If the Church of England intends to have Deaconesses, those who wish to become Deaconesses must see before their eyes an organisation sufficient; and they must also see that their religious training is fully and entirely provided for. I have, my lord bishop, now but one single remark to make. I appeal to the Episcopate through you. It is now, that the moment has come that women, devoted and excellent women, are ready upon all hands—it is that the chief pastors of our Church lose no time in thoroughly organising these diocesan Deaconesses institutions, due care being given to the religious training, and proper care during the time of probation. I need not speak of my twenty-five years' ministry in the country and the city as having shown me that without the tender aid of Women's Work we shall never grapple with our difficulties, and we shall never be able in sickness to provide the wants which we have to meet. Moreover, we shall never grapple with the steadily increasing want of purity and morality in the midst of our great towns—in which now, let me remind you, about 80 per cent. of the population is gathered—without Women's Work, organised and devoted. Without such aid, we shall never

grapple with these things. And if we do not, we know that the bride will not be adorned with her jewels, even the jewels of individual souls clothed with the righteousness given to those who serve their God in holiness below.

Carleton Baynes, Esq.

I SENT up my card in consequence of a remark that fell from Archdeacon Emery, who said that to form an organisation for training an army of ladies for parish work, they should be taught upon Church lines. Now, speaking of Church lines, it is not a simple form of speech. I know that there are many earnest Christian ladies, communicants of our beloved Church, who prefer to work in their own way, teaching religion as they think fit, but not upon Church lines. When I say Church lines, I mean, of course, those very lines which are taught by the consistent ministers of our Church. Having been for many years connected with a Deaconess Institution as secretary, I am sorry to say that, although ample provision for teaching has been made, the want of recruits to go forward and be taught, and fill the ranks of the army, is very much felt. The Deaconess Institution, as far as my experience has gone, provides not only for training, but also for teaching, upon definite Church lines, by the clergymen who form the committee of management, and direct the Deaconesses in their work. I have been astonished to find that the nursing work is so fashionable that many ladies proposed going into Deaconess Institutions, provided that they could be trained as nurses, otherwise they won't go into them. For the last few years I have had experience with parish nurses, and I have found that in reply to an advertisement for a parish nurse, there were no end of applications. It is, however, quite a mistake to suppose that parish nursing is easy work. It is, in fact, ten times harder than Deaconesses work. I would, however, take this opportunity of strongly encouraging all those ladies who feel inclined for the work of parish nursing, because I believe it is the most valuable work they can engage in. A parish nurse, you may say, is the receptacle of everybody's trouble. I have been told, and I firmly believe that there are many women who have troubles which they cannot tell their neighbours, or their pastor, or any person in the world, but there is in the conduct of the true parish nurse that which induces them to confide their troubles to her, and they do confide to her that which they would confide to no one else. The parish nurse may also become a friend of the young women of the parish, and become their adviser. But such is the difficulty, and such is the lowliness of parish nursing, that I have known, and not long ago, a parish nurse to leave her work because she was worn out with the continual working up-hill, and seeing no results ; but although she could not see any results while she stayed, when she went it was said in many and many a cottage—"We shall never look upon her like again." Therefore, although I say that the parish nursing is hard work, I would not say a word to discourage any one from it. But the point I want to bring forward is, that you must not imagine that because Archdeacon Emery has so well put forward his view, that there should be this organisation for training, that therefore recruits are ready at hand. There is a great want of recruits. The last speaker has alluded to the bishops organising Deaconess Institutions. Now immediately after the Congress of 1875, when this subject was discussed, I happened to know that a gentleman was commissioned by several of the bishops to interview the authorities of some of the Deaconess Institutions, with the view of getting them to agree to give their Church teaching upon the same distinctly recognised Church lines, so that each institution would be a help to the other. Very often an institution gets into trouble, and if they had the means of getting Deaconesses from other homes, they might be saved from a collapse by the timely help of a sister institution. But in spite of the encouragement thus offered, and the approval of two or three bishops and a dean, such was the *esprit de corps* of the institutions, that the idea fell through ; although all could see the great advantage and the permanent help they would receive. I have been told, and it was suggested by the last speaker, that the money difficulty is the difficulty. But is it quite fair that Deaconesses should be supported *while* they are being trained? Are curates paid whilst they are at the University? Directly a lady is ready to take the responsibility of her position, she is very often paid ; besides which, all the financial arrangements of deaconesses with their institutions are absolutely private, so that no earnest Christian Church of England lady,

although she may have no money, need feel that she would be debarred from entering a Deaconess Institution. I hope that there will be some recruits for training and instruction, and that there will not be so much of that jealousy between institutions as will prevent that which is so much desired, namely, that the bishops should organise all Deaconess Institutions as members of one establishment, and so uniformly that one would be able to help the other by sending Deaconesses from one institution to another, when required.

The Ven. FRED. BATHURST, Archdeacon of Bedford.

I SHOULD not have ventured to come before this great assembly if it had not been that I take very great interest in Deaconesses work, and your lordship was the first to introduce me to it. I shall say but as few words as possible. I see opposite me that great motto, "That they all may be one." I believe that to be a great principle which we hope to effect to-day with regard to Women's Work. I am quite sure that Canon Carter will say with me, that he would want to see all women working together as members of Christ's body, doing their work for Christ, and under Christ's authority. Now if we take that as our main principle, it follows, I think, that all Sisterhoods are in fact Deaconess Institutions the moment they place themselves under episcopal authority. And I am quite sure that in some degree every Deaconess Institution is in fact a Sisterhood. It does all the work that Sisterhoods are doing now; it can do what work large Sisterhoods have done; and the only thing we wish who defend the Deaconess Institutions as special organisations in the English Church—the one great object we have—is to bring all Women's Work under the authority which Christ has authorised in His Church, viz., the bishop. Now if we are all to be one, surely one cannot help regarding that in the great body of Christ's Church in England one of the most material parts has suffered paralysis for so many ages—a paralysis which has affected the whole. I hope to see that paralysis removed, and I hope that to-day will be the first day of the removal. I am glad that the Dean in his paper said he was not advocating a beginning of a new thing, but a recovery of something we had before. And it is that recovery that I hope to see carried out. Now the request of authority is one which is at least a proof of life. Is it or is it not a definite principle, that authority should come from above, and not from below? It seems to me that the authority under which women have been working hitherto has come from below; and it is just because that authority has come from below that we shall see, if we study past history, that it has invariably led to very serious dangers, difficulties, and disasters, and that is why I wish it to be altered now. Let me refer to the history of the Church of Christ in past ages. What was at the bottom of the destruction of our monasteries? It was because they depended upon a self-elected authority, and not upon an authority flowing from the head—the bishop. And if our Sisterhoods, or our congregation of women of any kind, are to be outside the discipline of the Christian Church, as given to us from God through our bishops, then that organisation cannot be a healthy one; it cannot do God's work in God's way. It must still be considered as the work of a partially paralysed member, and therefore an imperfect work. I do not deny that God always does bless honest work done for Him, even if it be outside His distinctly authorised agency; but I hold that God's blessings will flow most freely where His revealed will is most faithfully followed. Now that work which women do, and wish to do, is in itself so wide—it touches so deeply the heart of society, that it is a work without which no Church can be healthy, no parish can be healthy, and no diocese can be healthy. In my own parish I do not know what I should have done with 5,000 people if I had not had a deaconess working there for me. I should wish also to see all district visitors going forth with distinct episcopal authority, and should wish to see the nurses acting as my parish nurses going forth with distinctive episcopal authority; and I believe that, just as your lordship was one of those who first began to bring out lay readers, and give them the *imprimatur* of episcopal authority, and the comfort of episcopal benediction, so you are now one of the first who wish to send forward women to *their* work, and to give to them, of whatever class, the *imprimatur* of the bishop's authority and benediction, so that they may go forth as servants of Christ—Deaconesses in the truest sense of the word. This will give them what they want. I am not saying too much when I say women want to lean upon something, whether

they are called Deaconesses, Sisters, or Mission Women. They like to have and they need to have something upon which they can lean in the thousand difficulties which necessarily attach to their work ; and because they have that in the highest form in their bishop, they are more likely to have peace of conscience, peace of life, and God's blessing. I cannot go with Canon Carter when he draws his distinction between will and conscience. I do not understand how any person can rightly give up their will unless their conscience goes with that surrender of their will, nor how, with God's blessing, conscience can work one way and will another, and yet both be acting rightly. I hope that one result of this Congress may be that the paralysis which I conceive afflicts the body of Christ's Church in this matter of Women's Work may be removed ; that the circulation of the blood to and from the heart may be increased ; and that we may find our chief authorities banded together to give us what the Church of England so sadly wants—the possibility of faithful women of every age and rank in society going forth under episcopal authority to carry out their great work for Christ, to the salvation of souls, and the glory of God, and the comfort of their own lives, and that of their neighbours about them.

The Rev. GEORGE EVERARD, Vicar of St. Mark's, Wolverhampton.

I SHALL be glad if this Congress will allow me, ere this meeting closes, just to make a remark or two upon three subjects, and only a word upon each. There is one great subject which at present has not been touched upon, which is closely connected with all Women's Work, I mean the work of temperance. When you find a clergyman's wife wearing a little piece of blue, and going amongst the people as a total abstainer, you will find it has a mighty power and influence in the parish and in the congregation. Let me add also in respect of this, that the power of a lady's voice in singing is very great in helping men to overcome the enormous evil of intemperance, and inducing the people to keep out of the public-houses, especially in social gatherings on Saturday evenings. I should like also to allude to the important influence of Sunday school teachers, district visitors, and of those who hold mothers' meetings. If they would only throw their influence into the temperance work it would do a vast amount of good. Let me say that none ought to be so strong against the evils of intemperance as the women of England, for it is amongst the women that the evil is increasing day by day, whilst amongst the men it is diminishing. Therefore, let our sisters rise up to help in this battle, and fight manfully against this demon—strong drink. Another remark I may be permitted to make, although I cannot go into the question at length, but I wish to utter my own strong life-long conviction that anything like vows of celibacy are both utterly contrary to the spirit of holy Scripture, and also to the law of the Church of England. I believe for a season in the commencement of Sisterhoods they may perhaps give a fair show of beautiful fruit, but all experience shows the evil effects that hereafter result from them. The fruit will resemble that which arose from them in the middle ages. The one blot on the life of Sister Dora was the refusal to allow her to visit her dying father. We have been told that district visitors must go forth to their work in the power of the episcopal blessing. Yes, you must go forth under the shadow of the highest episcopal authority of all, of Him who is the chief shepherd and bishop of your souls. Look beyond man, look to Him, and His word, and depend upon His Spirit. The more you keep lowly at His footstool, the more you feel conscious of acceptance, and of fellowship with Him, the more you have the in-breathing of His own blessed Spirit dwelling in your heart, the more mighty will be your testimony on behalf of the Lord Jesus Christ. Then, sisters, go forth in the strength of Jesus, casting self-indulgence aside, casting love of praise aside, casting aside everything that keeps you back. Go forth in the name of Jesus, and in the power of His blessed Spirit, to gather in thousands and hundreds of thousands that are waiting for your efforts to gather them to the footstool of Him you love, and feeling that He is the friend of the poor, the friend of little children, the friend of the weary and the sorrowful. Whatever your avocation, whether as nurses—and I thank God my eldest daughter is hard at work as a nurse—or as Mission Women, or in district visiting, throw your whole heart into it. Never flinch from labour, and the work to which the Lord has called you will be a blessing.

The Bishop of Bedford.

I only wish to say one word, and it is to make a correction in the speech to which you have just listened. At the time that the life of Sister Dora was published, Mr. Postlethwaite wrote a letter to the *Guardian*, denying the truth about her alleged refusal to visit her dying father. But her successor in her great work is now sitting in this room, and she authorises me to say that that report had no foundation in fact.

The Right Rev. the Chairman.

I had no intention of saying anything upon this subject, although it is one most deeply interesting to me: but one or two things which have been said, lead me to add a few words if you will bear with me for a short time. Archdeacon Darby, in his very interesting speech, expressed a doubt whether my right reverend friend the Bishop of Durham and the Dean of Chester were right in saying that Phœbe was spoken of as a Deaconess. I venture to say, that though the Scriptural teaching concerning the existence of the deaconesses is one that may be controverted; yet the opinion of one so learned and impartial as the Bishop of Durham is a strong argument in its favour. But one argument I venture to offer, which is, I think, even stronger; and it is this, that if we are in any doubt as to what the writings of St. Paul may have meant, we have an admirable commentary upon them in the practice of the early Church; and we find there distinctly that what we suppose to be the order of deaconesses, spoken of by St. Paul, was from the first carried out in the practice of the early Church. I believe that it is quite clear that in the ancient Church there were deaconesses working in the ministry, and this goes far to prove that in the passages referred to in the New Testament, we have an authority for the work of deaconesses. Another thing said by Archdeacon Darby, was that no one should take vows before the age of thirty, but should continue to be probationers up to that time. But, I would remind you, that a great council in early times placed the age—not at thirty, but at forty—it having been found that there was some danger in the taking of vows at an earlier age. I do not wish to enter at length into this question of vows. It is one of great difficulty, and I have not time now. But Mr. Berdmore Compton spoke of the comparison between vows taken by a clergyman, and the vows taken by a Deaconess or Sister. I would venture to point out that the difference is very marked, in this way. In the English Church, a priest does not take a vow of celibacy. And that constitutes a great difference. A vow of celibacy is one which hitherto has not been accepted by the English Church since the Reformation. Certain conditions have been pointed out—and I am not prepared to say that the Church would certainly reject them—still I think we should be very careful now, before we give anything like a general Church sanction to vows of celibacy, whether in men or women. And certainly I ask you to remember that the early Church was doubtful about them, that a great Council forbade women to be introduced into these Sisterhoods under the age of forty. Now, I will turn to the more general subject of Deaconess Institutions, with which I am to a great extent familiar. We have one close to my own home—in the town close to my residence. A friend of mine, who was rather strongly prejudiced against them, has lately stayed in the town for two months. He had a strong feeling about Sisterhoods, and was prejudiced against Deaconesses; but when he saw what was doing by the Farnham Deaconesses, he was perfectly delighted with the work, and he said to me he had never seen anything so charming as the work of Deaconesses there. What especially struck him, he said, was the great cheerfulness which was thrown into the instruction of the young. He was struck with that as being marked, rather with Deaconesses than in the Sisters. A good deal has been said about trained nurses. We, in our diocesan Deaconesses Institution at Farnham, in general try to train up our Deaconesses as nurses, and give them six months' training at the County Hospital, and the result is they become most excellent nurses whenever they are wanted. That is not their special work. They have their work to do as Deaconesses in the parish. They attend to the instruction of young children—children, some of whom they rescue at an early age from a life of sin. But they also act as nurses when wanted, and it is delightful to hear the gratitude expressed to them for their nursing. The people who were very prejudiced when they first came to Farnham, are now very thankful indeed, and say that they do

not know what they should do without them, nor what they did before they came. But this is not confined to Farnham. My friend, Archdeacon Bathurst, has spoken of the Deaconesses in my late diocese of Ely. It is scarcely possible to over-rate the great assistance they were to me in my work there. Their nursing was something quite wonderful. There was an outbreak of small-pox in Bedford, and no one to nurse the people except the Deaconesses, and they proved to be good nurses as well as good teachers and workers in all ways. Archdeacon Darby appealed to me to take up the work of women, and especially the work of Deaconesses. I do not think I need that appeal. I have already said that I have presided over two dioceses—first, Ely, and then Winchester—in both of which there are Deaconess Institutions. If I had nothing else to be thankful for, I am thankful for the results of my work in helping to forward those two institutions. I believe that they have both been great blessings to their respective dioceses. All we want is a great extension of them in both cases. There is a difficulty in extending them. For some reason or other, ladies or women do not seem to be so ready to devote themselves as Deaconesses as for other work. I I hardly know why. It involves a greater amount of self-denial and self-devotion than the other works—the work, for instance, of trained nurses, or of district visitors. I think it involves a greater amount of self-denial and self-devotion than the being a member of a Sisterhood. But I do not think that devoted women shrink from what requires self-denial; and if they knew how much self-denial the work involves, and how much good it results in, they would be more ready to become Deaconesses. Whenever they have work in orphanages, in houses for destitute children, in the Camp at Aldershot, and wherever they have gone, they have done an amount of good, which I do not think anyone else could have done; and, therefore, when thoroughly known, I believe that Deaconess Institutions will commend themselves to the hearts and affections of all Churchmen and Christians. With regard to the appeal made to the bishops, by Archdeacon Darby, I heartily respond to it, and I hope all my brother bishops will do so too. And I would especially remark that the Archbishop of Canterbury—under whom we are all so anxious to work—takes a deep interest in Deaconess Institutions, and in all Woman's Work for good; and I believe he is ready to do all he possibly can to help them, and to give them his high and much esteemed patronage. Although I may not live to see it—for my days cannot be extended very long—I am sure there is a great future for Women's Work, and not the least for Deaconesses work in the Church of England. Such Deaconesses work I believe is according to the will of God, and distinctly according to Scripture, and to the practice of the ancient Church; and to the principles of the English Church, and a very necessary accompaniment to the general work of the Christian ministry. I trust, therefore, and believe, that God's blessing will be upon it.

TOWN HALL,

WEDNESDAY MORNING, OCTOBER 3RD.

The Right Rev. the PRESIDENT in the Chair.

(1) PURITY, AND (2) THE PREVENTION OF THE DEGRADATION OF WOMEN AND CHILDREN.

The Right Rev. the PRESIDENT.

I THINK I may venture to ask your concurrence and hearty participation in a prayer for the American Church, whose Convention meets to-day at Philadelphia, after a history of a hundred years; and I should like to add that it is their own prayer, and they may be saying it at this moment there.

The prayer was as follows:—

Almighty and everlasting God, Who, by Thy Holy Spirit didst preside in the Councils of the blessed Apostles, and hast promised, through Thy Son Jesus Christ, to be with Thy Church to the end of the world; we beseech Thee to be present with the Council of the American Church now assembled in Thy Name and Presence. Save them from all error, pride, and prejudice; and of Thy great mercy vouchsafe, we beseech Thee, so to direct, sanctify, and govern them in their present work, by the mighty power of the Holy Ghost, that the comfortable Gospel of Christ may be truly preached, truly received, and truly followed in all places, to the breaking down the kingdom of sin, Satan, and death; till at length the whole of Thy dispersed sheep, being gathered into one fold, shall become partakers of everlasting life, through the merits and death of Jesus Christ our Saviour. Amen.

PAPERS.

The Rev. Dr. RIDDING, The College, Winchester.

THE Archbishop's stirring Installation Speech at Canterbury called upon the Church to make an effort for the cause of Purity. I trust that every one here present is ready to respond to that call. Nothing but that call would have induced me to address this Congress on such a subject; and I only venture to do so because I know that I am addressing men who come, not to hear about the cause, but to support it.

You know the Church's duty in this cause; you know that work for moral and spiritual life has been recovering hearts to the Church during the last fifty years, even more than good work done in elevating worship and churchmanship. Many here present have themselves done devoted work in town and country, have prepared for the campaign, have made positions good, have forces at work that cannot be shifted. We are not called to new work. We are called on to combine and co-operate.

Three points will be regarded as essential by everyone for co-operation. First, it must combine all allies who are zealous for the cause. We

meet as churchmen in this Church Congress, but we know that the cause has been deeply at the heart of many who are united with us upon this, though they are divided upon ecclesiastical questions. And our Church movement must not repeat history's tragedy—of causes ruined by allies acting without concert. It must be a common advance along the whole line, concerted by all the forces of Christ's Church in England.

Secondly, our co-operation must combine, and not destroy, existing agencies. Definite societies are already organised, and much individual effort is being made. Our generalship must organise irregular forces, and employ them; it must not destroy what exists to substitute a great machinery which must be created. Hearts already engaged of themselves in the work are worth anything. Such workers are most sensitive of recognition and help; most easily discouraged by interference. The central spirit of our co-operation must be sympathy for independent effort, not officialism that crushes individual enthusiasm.

Thirdly, it must combine agencies as varied as the spheres in which it has to operate. Our nation divides itself into four zones, which cannot be dealt with all in the same way. The zone of trade and commerce stands apart from that which embraces London society, with its adjuncts of officers, professions, arts, Universities; and so does the artisan world of town life from that of the agricultural labourer, with its adjuncts of soldiers, sailors, and navvies. Our co-operation must be directed by a Cabinet, which must combine persons that know each of these zones, and how to deal with them; and it must act in separate departments, and know what it means to do before it begins.

So far I feel sure of agreement. The next point I add is: women must co-operate with men. It is the principal new feature that social evils are now discussed by good women, who used to be scrupulously kept in ignorance of their existence. Women's hearts are exercised by a knowledge of sin and suffering, and women's spirits stirred to take part in the crusade. Woman has been the lever of civilisation in the past, and Woman's alliance is really the feature that gives hope of any special change now in the prospect of the cause of purity. The question is, *in what way* women are to co-operate? As social influences they have the chief power, if they are strong enough to use it. In every home they can be centres of bright, healthy life, to keep young society happily together in its true natural tone.

Shall they go out as active agents abroad? I cannot doubt that the experience assembled in this room will agree that in all practical work affecting the relation of the sexes, even in preventive and rescue work, men and women not only *must* co-operate, if the blunders are to be avoided which arise when either sex acts alone in its absolute ignorance of the other, but *can* and *do* co-operate without the least awkwardness or indelicacy, so long as the relations of sex are presumed and do not themselves become matters of discussion. On the other hand, nothing that requires actual reference to sexual relations can be generally discussed by men and women together without sacrificing modesty, which is the essential purity, the purity of thought and feeling. Public discussion is impossible; confidences are worse. Normally, in advocating purity itself, men and women must co-operate as allies in parallel columns, men appealing to men, women to women; and must

concert action only through their directing heads, or through the subaltern points of communication established by husbands and wives engaged in the same work. Times of revolution justify abnormal procedure, if the revolution is adequate. Men have been stirred by noble-hearted women's indignation against wrong-doing more deeply than men could have stirred them; and when we deprecate such public appeals of women generally, we are bound to ask whether men are ready to appeal instead, or only really desirous to silence appeals? I honour these women's exceptional daring and power. They have really done the new work. This meeting is due to their stirring movement. There is still much stirring for them to do. But still they are exceptions that prove the rule. Such crusades strike by the strangeness of their chivalry. They cannot be common with effect; and indeed they are in themselves withdrawals, however justifiable, from women's more natural offices, of stirring women, and of setting examples of womanhood.

The next question is, what is to be organised? Movements must be made as best they can. This generation seems to move in the form of Societies, and if men need to be started in organised crusade, with the support of authorised action with recognised comrades, be it so. May it help them not to fail their standard, or flag in their service! But if the loyal do indeed need to profess allegiance afresh, in order to challenge others to join in retaking a position which has never in theory been abandoned, yet such profession must not dwell on itself, but should turn from contemplation of the idea to some healthy practical action. I need not point out the difficulties of testing members of a Society for professing the principles of purity; or the unfitness of the subject for debates at meetings, such as those that urge the cause of temperance. Debates on intemperance are not drunkenness; debates on purity may easily be impurity. I think that men of the highest character will demur to being asked to rank themselves as pure or impure; I have reason to fear that a society which directs its members to press this subject in general conversation will endanger the fine edge of its members' own delicacy while dwelling on it, and even provoke disputants to maintain the cause of impurity. I doubt moral Ribbonism.

But the country does want a Church Union and Church Association to assist the moral and spiritual work of the Church in two ways. It needs combined attention and support to moral social questions, a combination to insist on political, social, educational, hygienic reforms, to elevate the character and condition of the people; and it needs the creation of a social public opinion, capable of setting a social ban upon personal immorality. I think that this public opinion will be best created by the natural method, already adopted in parishes and schools, and other centres of life and society, with success, *i.e.*, selecting the spirits fittest to leaven *secretly* their surroundings with a higher tone; and inspiring them at the fittest moment, by some heart-touch, with the earnest desire to do so. The ultimate infection of a new spirit into actual people must come from personal contact of heart with heart, whatever central organisation is established.

Then these individual spirits will be best combined to form a public opinion for social action by associations directed primarily to some social purpose, but in which the members should claim that moral

character should be a condition of admission, on the principles so well known in Christian Young Men's Associations and the Girls' Friendly Society. Clubs for recreation or for social friendliness, which would blackball a cheat or a liar, are the natural machinery for uniting men in maintaining the true level of morality. And, indeed, such social arrangements are the sphere in which men may most reasonably claim to look for moral character in their associates.

A standing social vigilance committee proposed in this Congress may raise the cry of "paternal government by clerical pedagogues." But the Church will only be leading the people to desire a paternal government of social reform, instead of political repression; and liberty will not be sacrificed to morality by measures that protect the mass against the license of well-to-do young men. Every generation of young men has been the happier for each social rebellion against their vicious excesses in the past, Feudal, Cavalier, Mohock; and well-to-do young men will derive nothing but benefit now, if class resentment should rebel effectively against the rich debauching the sisters and daughters of the poor. Nor will the sense of the people see any unfairness in legislation if, after ruining without compensation the honourable trade of cities, the honourable investments of shareholders, the honourable profession of agriculture, for the economic advantage of the mass, it feels justified, when considering moral reforms, in refusing immunity or compensation to dishonourable speculations in houses for immoral trade, or tenures which breed immorality, and declines to admit that investments in rookeries and gin-palaces have a claim to the protection denied to the merchant traders of Bristol and the farmers of England. Men who believe that people's happiness rests on moral as much as on material conditions, may well promote paternal government in reforming social abuses. It is time that the laws of England should not stand out as laws made by men for men only. Legislation can only alter circumstances; but when women are starved into vice, and families thronged into vice, and streets pestered into vice, circumstances are a great part of the battle.

Still, social spirit is the greater part. Even for any immediate action in purging streets, and putting sin out of mind by putting it out of sight, social spirit must pronounce; for the authorities will not show vigour beyond the feeling shown by their town. Towns which have pronounced, have shown the effect of citizens giving personal lead to general opinion, and to practical action against evils, which the majority had found intolerable, but had supposed that they must submit to. In the inner life of Society, in all classes, the chief effect must come from social example. The present reign has shown very clearly how Society responds to Court example; and the nation's moral feeling has a witness to its ultimate soundness in the strength added to general loyalty towards our Queen by respect for her example as a woman. Every clergyman feels the irresistible effect of "the great house" on his parish; and most know how different that influence has become in this generation. Purity is, after all, true to nature; and to the great majority it is an element not of conventional restraint, but of general comfort and happiness. Leaders of Society who assert it will soon find the mass, who look to see what others think, greatly relieved to find themselves not expected to profess to like unnatural nastiness, which is only really

pleasant to an ill-conditioned minority, and to most of them only a form of cubbishness, upon which they look back as insane folly. Let leaders believe others and believe themselves. Society will respond to a good lead more happily than to a bad; though, without a lead, *Sectatur partem conclusio deteriorem*, public opinion will only exact what the lowest will accept, and will not coerce the minority.

Two points I venture to observe. First, I think that people are often liable to attach too little consequence to the power of very high tone in a small circle. Earnest religious principle, distinguished *salon* refinement, seems to them to exist in too limited spheres to be of any account. But brightness and intensity of points of life penetrate further than diffused nebulousness. A wide circle takes a real light, though it cannot kindle it, and will not bear its responsibility. Homes of absolutely pure girlhood are pearls of inestimable price. It is the high religious reality of many small centres that uplifts the general tone in widening circles round.

Secondly, I think that the special form of weakness in society at this time is fear of conventionality, or rather uncertainty of what is conventional and what is real. In social points which may easily pass into indelicacy, transition from continental restraint on young society to transatlantic freedom makes a temporary derangement of the balance. Freedom will fix the point of truth safely for refined tempers, if leaders of society are clear in drawing a strong line for true and certain principles. Refinement ought to be distinct in its verdicts about novels and poetry and newspapers for homes. There is no want of novels in England which combine bright interest and healthy tone. Aphrodisiac poetry ought to find no admission. Newspapers are more pressing, and make their lines of demarcation less distinct; and society does need its police. But refinement can distinguish the healthy satire of *Punch* from the unhealthy innuendoes of scandal. Again, if foul photographs are the pollutions of the vulgarist, so refinement ought to exclude the sensuous nudities which make picture galleries unfit for men and women to visit together, and which are at once unnatural in themselves to this stage of civilisation, immoral in their method of bribing models out of modesty, and debasing to the moral and the art feeling of artist and spectator. But it has been left (I do not say by art-critics, but by social authorities) to the invaluable public guardian, *Punch*, to protest against the degradation of our picture galleries. Society has been afraid of being conventional.

Conventionality, again, is the argument against morality itself. It is established, it is religious, it is conventional; it cannot be true. The agreement of religion and morality has been made a hindrance to both. Immorality has condemned religion, and irreligion has condemned morality; not only among the uneducated, but even in impulsive temperaments of a higher order rebelling against conventionality. Still, on the other hand, Thinkers who have abandoned Christianity on philosophic grounds, have by their honest thinking made morality more real to themselves on its moral basis than conventional professors of religion make it on unrealised religious grounds. They have seen its truth, if Christians think not its whole truth; and as truth they live in it. If they give up the teaching and hopes of religion as motives, and even deny the spiritual personality of man, that does not destroy the moral

obligations of the body to its own nature, nor its moral, mental, and material functions and conditions. The body's duties are of this life, even if they have motives beyond. Religion imposes no positive laws, only moral ones—what is good for man, as man, while he lives as man. Its teaching is for this life, if its hopes go beyond. Mental, moral, spiritual phenomena exist just the same, whatever be their ultimate metaphysical account, and some conditions of them are good and others bad, and the same are good and the same bad, as have been marked such by moralists. The more close and material the connection of those phenomena with body or bodily function, the more obligatory is it on the body to maintain its highest condition in all those parts and functions, which, on such a theory, affect mechanically and immediately those mental, moral, and spiritual bodily phenomena, which make the elevation and happiness of the Body-man, as well as of the Body-social in the home and in the State. Moralists have not determined these duties by religion; they have read them as laws impressed on our nature. The real thinkers will not quote the savage as the standard of nature for civilised man, any more than they would measure natural decency by savage, or child, or animal. They will not be unhistoric enough to allege that the art and literature of Hellas derived their inspiration from Bacchanalian and Aphrodisian orgies, which they know that Hellas utterly rejected in her age of literature and art; nor make Greek genius justify Greek vice any more than Greek slavery, nor turn Plato's exclusive State control of parentage into a system of savage promiscuous intercourse. They will not question the binding truth of the moral sentiment of purity, because it has been the growth of ages of civilisation advancing in purity with it, any more than they question civilisation itself, or the growth of art, or of learning. They will not require it to be proved or presented in words, or think that it is nothing because all people do not see it or agree in its application; they know that it was a true reply to the girl who saw no harm in being a nude model, to say, "If you don't see the indelicacy, it's no use proving it to you;" they know that immediate sense does not admit of proof or presentation in words for moral sentiments any more than for physical perceptions, and that, as the sense of beauty has no proof, so neither has the duty of truth nor the duty of honour; nor are they natural to savages or children, or indeed anything but marks of the highest races in their highest development.

A school of moralists which needs to rest a virtuous principle upon a lower utilitarian basis of advantage, will see motive enough in the streets of London, in the slavery and disease of systematised vice, in gaols and lunatic asylums; in the waste of men's lives and characters, in the ruin of powers and prospects, in the paralysis of energy and interest, in the degradation of aim and idea; in that disbelief in anything good, that community with low views in everything, that coarseness in taste and conscience, which attends in proportion all degrees of the animalism which is the heaviest burden on our national advance, as it crushes the finer feelings and the finer relations of life which centre in English homes—motive surely enough to forbid the individual to be an element in this mass of slavery and corruption.

Thinkers who have realised this, find it so, and they live in it. The Christian believer carries his thoughts beyond this life: and in this life

believes that his body, so fearfully and wonderfully made, is the work of God, and can and does receive constant renewals of God's vivifying power; and in the belief that his body is the Temple of the Holy Spirit, and in his hope of the Resurrection of his body incorruptible, the Christian has his sacred special motives not to sin against his own body by impurity.

Is this motive not enough? Many surely here know that in the time of temptations, when the bewilderment of passion took little thought of risk, of ruin, of disease, or shame, or even of wrong to others who would gladly have sinned with them, there has been power to hold them back in the deeply ingrained principle of duty, that would not let them so sin against God. And what they know of themselves, they feel no less sure of in many of that intimate circle of friends, which they knew as well as themselves at that early time when man knows man better than he does afterwards. They would not for anything give up their assurance, that many have been carried pure through life by Christian principle, and have found their happiness in it.

For purity is true to nature, for a man's self and for society; it can only be in the assurance of its truth that we desire to urge it. We do desire to urge it, all of us who are here present; and yet, while we seem to contradict ourselves by this very meeting, we ask how we can do so without risking it? Are we to preach about it? The clergy are taunted with not preaching the Seventh Commandment, as if they showed cowardice or indifference, or as if churchgoing people were left in doubt about the commandment. Churchgoing people hear very plain and uncompromising language read in their ears out of the Bible, which a preacher could not say so strongly—they at least can have no question—or if any forms of sin are unmeaning to them, so much the happier for them. Many clergymen have felt driven to preach plain words; but if they chance on their way home to hear young men ask young women queer questions, for which their sermon has given a handle, which might never else have been given, they may think twice before making a second such venture. Experience, not cowardice, says that mixed congregations can only be addressed with sacred reverent reserve in general exhortations on sexual relations. Spades are spades, but they must be handled wisely.

Are we to teach? Of course—parents children, women girls, men boys. But how? by explanation and information? No! but by silence and reserve. Modesty and delicacy are the base of purity, and they are taught by modesty and delicacy. They are sentiments to be caught by infection, not learnt by statement. They must be caught in earliest infancy, from pure-minded mothers and nurses, who make the child feel that every indelicacy is shocking, and who treat precocious tendencies not with amusement, but as the serious beginnings of sentiments which develop as they are begun, and are impressed mainly by the real spirit of the nursery and the home. This is the main thing. Modesty carried through childhood escapes most of the dangers of boyhood, by repelling the first approaches of evil with real repugnance; it avoids naturally all that leads to self-corruption; it makes naturally good friends; it has the defence of a good character. Impurity among boys is gregarious rather than tyrannical, and mostly fastens on the predisposed. Still we must not throw the whole onus on the nursery. Boyhood is

the testing time of many, and those in charge of boys have their part to do in maintaining or correcting their tendencies. No one can be more alive to this than schoolmasters. They must do so on the same principles of delicacy and reserve as befitted the treatment of children. Naturally, sexual ideas ought not to be known; and the essential thing to aim at for boys and young men, is to keep the animal ideas out of the mind; to guard the avenues of eye, ear, hand; but mainly to provide the true conditions of purity, healthy *régime* of body, active occupation of mind, happy recreation, and safeguards against evil in circumstances and society. And then withal to kindle a spirit repugnant to it, refinement of taste, elevation of tone, fine interests, and a sacred respect for modesty in self and others. But, in all, to aim at keeping the idea of impurity out of the thoughts. Tom Brown's father judged rightly, on many grounds. Masters may be bound to give general warnings—Confirmation is a natural time in boyhood—but with the reserve that marks the subject as only touched from necessity. Personal warnings, where known to be necessary, must be as plain as is necessary. But even then it will rarely be the warning that influences so much as the reserve. From first to last, the one essential for influence is reality: and the reality marked in a school *system of dealing with* impurity is more effective than talk and warnings. However, this is not the place for a discussion on school morality. No school of character but cares for this vital point in the way which it deems best. Discussion here will not add to schoolmasters' will or knowledge.

Young men may need arguments; and some will listen to lay writers rather than clerical; yet, if men come for advice to clergy, clergy must be able and ready to advise. They must master the question, and be able to speak, not only from their own impressions, but with the scientific knowledge of experts in a branch of clerical advice. It is part of their business. Really men usually only want the simple hard rule of self-control, and the only true advice from doctor or friend is not to let them shirk this necessity. In the main, they have to overcome temptations from pampered bodies, and idle excitements, from false situations and unnatural circumstances, from city loneliness or city gregariousness. Healthy conditions of life remain the natural safeguard of natural purity: equable employment and satisfaction of body and mind. Athletic exercise alone, sedentary business alone, religious meditation alone, breed unwholesome humours. Combine them all for health. Chivalry or principle ought to keep young men from wronging others, and from treachery to their future home. For themselves, older experience may assure them, and doctors add professional assent, that nature requires no young man to anticipate the natural times and purposes of her gifts; that premature waste of vital force is profligate bankruptcy for maturity; that intemperance has not more victims of extreme excess in gaols and asylums than unchastity; nor has it ruined more careers of promise in public and intellectual life; and that if habits of self-indulgence have worked unhealthy condition, that is not to be met by other unnatural habits, but by manly recovery of healthy condition. But, as I said before, principle and prudence ought in reason to have the natural support of social opinion.

Is there any Body more clearly called upon to give this support than this Church Congress? At the same time, is any Body

more called upon to do so wisely? I know very well that eager and despairing workers feel it disheartening if caution and patience are urged, or if any special method is questioned. And I know that matters have been left to drift far enough to justify despair in thinking nothing enough to overtake them. But surely the last fifty years have not done nothing—surely the reason for a joint effort now is even more the advance made than the shortcoming. What does a meeting like this mean? The noble-hearted workers who have stirred us have worked individually, and I doubt if they would or could have done their work otherwise. Despair says, something must be done; but wisdom says, not everything, not what will undo what has been done, not "what kills the goose to get eggs quicker," not what contradicts the essence of the work. Each man here may be a centre of brave, clear, action and opinion, but if work is to be lasting it must be on true lines; it must not rest on impulsive or gregarious movements, nor count the number of recruits to a profession, but aim at the deeper, simpler, reality of touching men's hearts and lives, and spreading independent individual earnestness. Purity must be regarded, not as a tenet of a sect, but as a natural part of common life, to be expected of all, and specially to be looked for in personal intimacy and friendship.

Old and young must be ready to act. Perhaps it may seem reasonable to call most on the older part. But in this matter reality is between people of the same age, and the sphere of use, if not of need, is more really open to the younger than the older men.

Of older men we need not speak: "If they are filthy, they will be filthy still." Young men! the call is for your generation—for you! You know your generation, what they need, and what they will accept. For yourselves, and for your more ignorant brothers, accept, avow, maintain, the true level, because it is the true level—by profession, if necessary, but normally by your own lives, by that transparent avowal of a real life and spirit which stamps itself unconsciously, but unmistakably, on a brow that all can read; preach without preaching, in season and out of season, Nature's true Law of Purity.

The Rev. and Hon. A. T. Lyttelton, Master of Selwyn College.

I PROPOSE to speak of the promotion of purity among young men, and to consider, first, the necessity of action in this matter, and, secondly, some of the principles on which our action should be based.

I. We are met, in this as in most other social questions, at the outset by objections to any action at all. We are told that the evil is exaggerated, and that those who speak about it are morbid, dwelling on the bad side without taking the good into account. That is one kind of objection.

Again we are told, very commonly, that though impurity is a very fearful and widespread evil, yet it cannot be dealt with by speech or open action; it must be treated by silence, lest the innocent should be contaminated by the very means adopted to preserve them from sin;

we should keep, it is said, to the old plan of general exhortations to morality, but go into no details, and, so far at least as public utterances are concerned, ignore the whole subject. That is another, and a more serious objection.

But, graver still, because more widespread among those to whom we wish to appeal, is the belief that all such efforts are useless because incontinence in young men is inevitable, and indeed necessary for the preservation of health. Perhaps this extreme view is not always maintained; but at least it is held that no young men are, as a matter of fact, free from this vice, except in a comparatively few very peculiar cases. Efforts to promote purity will result, it is said, only in the promotion of hypocrisy; the only check to impurity is early marriage, and, as this in nine cases out of ten is impossible, we can but acquiesce in the prevalence of vice.

I do not think I have misrepresented the objections; I am certainly quite aware of their gravity. But, as to the first, I would say that every fresh opportunity for getting information, every day in which one studies the subject, adds to the conviction that the evil is not exaggerated. We may—I do not think we do—exaggerate the extent of the impurity in schools and Universities, for as to this we are to a certain extent in the dark; but as to the sin of fornication in our great towns there is, unhappily, no room for doubt. The awful statistics of prostitution are a sufficient answer to this objection. In London alone there are 80,000 outcast women.

And that fact is, I think, an answer to the second objection also. Do you tell me that silence is the only method of dealing with this gigantic evil? We answer that silence has failed. Whatever else ought to be said or done, there is one thing which, till everything else has been tried, cannot be done, and that is to ignore or silently to deplore the evil. The present state of society has grown up under a *régime* of silence on this subject. Laws are passed in Parliament, punishments are inflicted in schools and universities, women and children are protected, but it is all done with the minimum of discussion; and the consequence is that the men who perpetuate the evil grow up in ignorance, and live on in ignorance of what they are doing, not knowing, or at least not realising, what their selfish impurity means to others as well as to themselves. I do not wish to underrate the difficulties or the dangers of speech on this subject; I know that those who have started this movement have reckoned them over and over again; but no one who looks at the facts can hesitate for long as to which side the balance inclines. On one side there is the danger of speaking out; on the other, the danger of allowing the present state of things to continue, probably to grow worse; for we ought to remember that under the system of silence the prostitution of women has been succeeded by the prostitution of girls, and that is now becoming the prostitution of children. We have tried shutting our eyes and our lips; that, at least, has failed, and we must, as Christians, try something else. And we cannot, plausible as it sounds, agree with those who advise us to confine our efforts to the vicious, and leave the innocent in their innocence. Among those of whom I am thinking, public school and University men, hardly any are ignorant, hardly any, therefore, are in danger of contamination from plain speaking on this subject. And, further, it is a sad truth that those who are

already vicious will not—I had almost said, cannot—be restrained; we must prevent, because cure is so difficult. Let me quote the words of one of the greatest medical authorities on the subject: "The agony of breaking off a habit which so rapidly entwines itself with every fibre of the human frame is such, that it would not be too much to say to any young man commencing a career of vice, 'You are going a road on which you will *never* turn back. However much you may wish it, the struggle will be too much for you. You had better stop now. It is your last chance.' There is a terrible significance in the wise man's words, '*None* that go to her return again, neither take they hold on the paths of life.'"

Well, these things should be known by those whom they most concern, the young men who are on the threshold of life; and to be known they must be spoken of—cautiously indeed, and solemnly, and with a manly reserve—but still plainly, and as part of the necessary moral training for the trials of life. That is part of our answer to the second objection.

But when I come to the third objection, I find it difficult to speak as I should wish. It cannot be needful in an assembly of Christians to refute the doctrine that fornication is a physical necessity; nor ought it to be needful to declare my conviction that thousands of young men in England do, by the grace of God, and by the force of example and of early training, keep themselves pure in deed and thought. But yet it is a fact that this degrading doctrine is taught and believed. I could name a book written by a physician, of which some 20,000 copies have been sold in London, which is based upon the theory that chastity is physically injurious to men and women alike, and which advocates universal fornication from the earliest possible age. And it is not only in anonymous books and among the half-educated youths of our large towns that these doctrines prevail. You will find that among men and even women of the highest education and refinement there is a general belief that all young men are vicious; husbands, perhaps to excuse their own sins, tell their wives that no one is free from them; and thus young men lose one great safeguard of virtue, the hopeful and confiding faith of their mothers and sisters. This is surely the stronghold of impurity, this popular belief in its necessity, or at least in its universality. Many men—I believe I might say, most men—go out of our Universities pure in deed; but, with this pestilent belief implanted in their minds, it needs but a touch to make them fall. This, then, is the point to be attacked; and surely it cannot be attacked better than by an organised protest against such a doctrine, a protest which shall make itself heard as plainly as the doctrine—in short by a society which shall not shrink from publicity, and one great object of which shall be to convince the world that purity is possible.

But there is other work for such associations. The medical authority I have already quoted, a writer who is convinced of "the great mental, moral, and physical advantage of early continence," goes on to complain of the small help given by the clergy of the English Church to those who seek advice from them on this matter. He contrasts the valuable recommendations to be found in Roman Catholic works with the vague and unpractical treatment of the subject in Anglican works. Though it is probable that there has been some improvement since his book was

written (I quote from an edition of 1871), yet it is true that there is great ignorance among the clergy and teachers of all kinds, and the result, to use his own words, is that "there are to be found very few discussions on the subject of sexual temptations which can be appealed to as real *aids to continence.*" And sometimes the evil goes further. I lately heard of a case in which the most horrible advice was given by a well-known clergyman to a person who sought his help; and I can only hope that this was done through ignorance. Surely this should be remedied; and those who are called upon to guide others, clergymen, schoolmasters, fathers of families, should know the facts on this most momentous subject. A Purity Association can do this. By recommending books, by disseminating religious and medical pamphlets on these topics, by promoting thought about them, such an association can do much to prevent that ignorance which is helping to ruin young men's lives, to cover the walls with the foul notices of advertising quacks, and to fill the streets of our towns with outcast women. As a contribution to this work I shall be glad to give to anyone who wishes it the title of the work I have already quoted, one of the most helpful guides on the subject. I would mention it publicly but that, being a medical book, written primarily for the medical profession, it should, perhaps, be confined to those who are called upon to teach, and not recommended indiscriminately to all.

But, speaking now especially of University men, the chief use of Purity Associations is to prepare them for the life which lies before them. The free and healthy companionship and occupations of University life often preserve men from sins of impurity with little conscious effort on their part; and it is afterwards, when they find themselves almost alone and comparatively unnoticed in the outset of their professional lives, that the temptation comes upon them in all its strength. Prepare them, then, for this by some previous warning; let them realise the problem before the dangerous moment comes; show them beforehand the physical, social, and moral results of vice; appeal to their sense of chivalry and honour on behalf of women; send them out into the world persuaded that continence is the best and noblest life for a young man, and that each man ought to do something to help others to be chaste; and you will find that young professional men, instead of being, as they too often are, the foremost to degrade women, will be the foremost in raising and protecting them, and, by working to make others pure, will find it not hard to keep themselves pure also.

II. Such are some of the reasons why action in this matter is necessary, and why that action should be public and combined. As to the principles on which our action should be founded, there is not so much need to dilate, for there can hardly be much controversy. It must surely be based on the principles of unselfishness, self-restraint, and religion. It should start, not with self-regarding exhortations to personal purity, but with the appeal to men to be pure for the sake of others; for the sake of younger men; for the sake of women; for the sake of the national life. But there is a deeper consideration to appeal to. The evil arises, in great measure, from the belief that it is good to give a free course to our natural appetites; men are being taught in widely read books that it is a sin to restrain the sexual passions. I quote the actual words: "It is most unwise to suppose that our chief duty with regard to our appetites and passions is

to exercise self-denial." In short, chastity is called a sin. Now, surely against this teaching we have to set the definite Christian principle of self-restraint leading to a life of self-renunciation. We may give up the Puritan doctrine that man is wholly bad, but it is not to adopt the teaching of modern Pelagianism that man is wholly good. And now I approach the difficult subject of marriage; and may I say here that the want of preaching on marriage is a great defect in our Church? I can only remember having heard one sermon on the subject in my life. Yet one great foundation of purity is a right conception of the nature and objects of holy matrimony. Men would find the self-restraint of youthful chastity easier if they realised that the essence of Christian marriage is not self-indulgence, but self-restraint, and that no true physical or spiritual welfare can result from marriage if this is ignored. When St. Paul is dealing with this subject, he bases his precept, not on the necessity of gratifying the individual passion, but upon the unselfish consideration which husband and wife should have for one another. So that even the lawful gratification of the sexual passion is brought under the great Christian law of unselfishness, and men are once more taught that the secret of the Christian life in all its relations is self-renunciation.

This should be taught to young men as the ideal of marriage; and to have a worthy conception of marriage would in many cases help men to realise the true position of women, and the Christian view of the relations between men and women. Such thoughts, such ideals, are the great safeguards of purity, while, on the other hand, nothing is so likely to lead to impurity as that foolish notion so common among young men, that women are to be treated as toys, with behaviour and conversation that are unworthy and derogatory even when they are not absolutely degrading both to women and to men.

But we must go further still. Appeal to men's chivalry and unselfishness on behalf of women; teach them that the sexual appetites were given to be restrained and sanctified by the blessed discipline of marriage; but you have not done all. I do not believe that this subject can be approached—I am sure it cannot be safely or beneficially touched—except as a part of religion. The only motive that is powerful enough permanently to check and eventually to silence men's passions is the love of the Incarnate Son of God. If we could only make the Incarnation a reality to men; could make them realise the personal union of every Christian with Christ; could make them see, by the virtue of the Incarnation, the Divinity in humanity; could make them feel the ever-present Friendship of Him who by His purity made men pure, this vice would become impossible to them. That which is our starting point is also, when perfected, our goal; it is useless to begin till we have found in a man some religious feeling on which we can work; we may lay aside the work when he has been brought to realise that he is one of the members of Christ, and his body is the Temple of the Holy Ghost.

The Rev. Canon W. Butler, Worcester.

The subject on which I am to address you follows closely on that which has so far during this morning's meeting occupied our attention.

Previous speakers have had to do with the virtue of *Purity*, the need of crucifying the flesh with the passions and lust, of "walking in holiness;" of "glorifying God in the body and in the spirit which are God's." It falls to me and to those who follow me to complete the tale, to speak of that which results from the vice which is opposed to purity; to show, and if possible suggest some remedies in order to stay, the degradation and ruin of those who, if men had cared to "possess their vessel in sanctification and honour;" who, if only preserved from man's aggression and properly dealt with, would never, or at least in fewest instances, fall from the right path. All woman's degradation—I hesitate not to say it—is to be traced in the first instance to the recklessness and brutality of man. A great statesman is said to have asked, when told of any enormous crime, "Where is the woman?" It may with no less reason be asked, when any woman falls into degradation "Where is the man?"

When we speak of woman's degradation, let us consider what the words imply. What is woman, as God has created her? She is the help meet for man, made such as to supply the instinct implanted in man by God Himself which craves for sympathy and fellowship, belonging to the time of man's innocency, and therefore outside of all that is impure and carnal; sufficiently like man to be able to enter into his pursuits and interests, and yet sufficiently unlike him to be able to bring into use a different range of faculties, unfit for much of that which falls to the lot of man, yet, on the other hand, capable of much that man cannot do; a being loving and impulsive rather than calculating and firm, with heart stronger than head, clinging to support rather than standing alone. As the last formed of God's creatures, we must, I think, recognise her to be the noblest and most perfect of all.

> "Fairest of creation, last and best
> Of all God's works, creature in whom excelled
> Whatever can to sight or thought be formed;
> Holy, divine, good, amiable and sweet."

Her perfection, as it seems, consists in her superior beauty and attractiveness, her greater power of sympathy, her more complete unselfishness, her far truer religious instincts, her keener appreciation of religious things, her greater power of knowing and of loving God. Ever since the Fall, is it not true that the life of many women in all ranks and positions, following in the train of her "whom all generations shall call blessed," is the life almost of angels, the very realisation of the words, "He that is born of God sinneth not?"

> "The reason firm, the temperate will,
> Endurance, foresight, strength and skill;
> A perfect woman, nobly planned
> To warn, to comfort, and command;
> And yet a spirit still, and bright
> With something of the angel light."

And yet this is also true, that, even as the corruption of that which is best is ever the worst, *so* the ruined woman will too often reach a degree of degradation most complete and loathsome—become a very

cage of unclean birds, a focus from which corruption and evil of every kind flow forth, ruining, as if in righteous retribution, man the ruiner, filling him with all iniquity and bringing thousands to ruin of both body and soul. The degradation, as I venture to assert, of woman, lies not in one thing only—the most obvious and repulsive of all—but in all that separates her from the proper purposes of her being; all that makes her something other than the helpful and faithful wife, the watchful and loving mother, the purifier of social life, the bright spot in society from which light and sweetness flow, the happinéss maker, the unselfish and tender influence; all that in any way stimulates her to be coarse, masculine, immodest, whether as the slave of sexual passion or the encourager of vice; all that fosters in her self-assertion and intellectual pride; all that tends to dull or kill in her those womanly religious instincts which form one of hèr greatest charms.

There is, of course—rising like some ghastly spectre, never ceasing to haunt and threaten—the one hideous and loathsome form of degradation which is generally understood when the degradation of women is named. It ever, alas! stares us in the face. Its victims are indeed a huge array. Talk of drunkenness and its evil results! While the one slays its thousands, this of which I speak slays its tens of thousands. It is, I fear, no exaggeration to say that, out of the 24,000,000 inhabitants of this country, not less that 200,000 women in one form or other ply this dreadful trade—are simply hired receptacles of masculine lust. Made as they are for God and helps meet for men, they simply do Satan's work and help "sin to reign in man's mortal body, that he should obey it in the lusts thereof." Nor does this calculation include those multitudes who, without actually haunting the streets, gain a sinful livelihood by being, as the expression is, "kept" by men. Nor, again, those myriads of cases which so continually wring the pastor's heart, when young and fair girls—once, it may be, the delight of parent and teacher—bright, pleasant, modest, respected—are seduced, ruined, degraded, made ready to be cast away. And here let it be remembered that in such cases it is above all true that it is the first step that costs. Chastity once yielded, there are few who have the courage to make a further stand. The woman once fallen is never again what she was. She may indeed, and frequently, thanks be to God, does repent; sometimes even seeks to atone for the past by a life of strictness and of service; but she never loses the recollection that she has suffered to be filched from her her virgin purity, and become despicable in her own eyes as well as in the eyes of the world.

It has been my duty, as chairman of the Committee of Convocation on this painful subject, to investigate in somewhat close detail the condition of various parts of the country—the agricultural districts, the large towns and commercial centres, the military and naval depôts—and much has come to my knowledge of a very startling kind. Trustworthy informants from Plymouth and elsewhere have described to me orgies which would have disgraced the most profligate heathen cities—young boys and girls cohabiting in multitudes openly in one room; girls of tenderest age decoyed and made victims to men, sometimes of respectable position in the world, old enough to be their grandfathers. I have read—and the evidence is open to anyone who will take the trouble to procure it—of a regular and horrible trade carried on between this

country and the Continent, of girls persuaded by false promises, then sold, invoiced like mere parcels of merchandise, received into wicked houses, kept there like slaves against their will, forced through threatenings of punishment to yield themselves to prostitution to the brutes, the regular customers of these places, who watch for their arrival and pay money for that which is more precious than blood or even than life itself.

As a specimen of the cool cynicism with which this work is carried on, let me read one letter out of many taken from the Minutes of Evidence of the Commission of the House of Lords.

"GREEK STREET, SOHO, *April* 3, 1878.

"MADAME,—I hasten to let you know that I have two pretty English girls who wish to go into a house. Their real ages and all the papers are quite in order. I have not the advantage of being known by you, but I beg you to believe that I do not act like Kleber. With me everything must be in order, for since the affair of Kleber it has become dangerous to take English girls abroad with false promises and without having fulfilled the necessary formalities. You will observe that I am anxious to do business in a regular way. My price is 300 fr. per woman; say 600 fr. for the two. I will bring them to Ostend to you, when you can come and fetch them.

"I am, &c.,

"(Signed) RAPHAEL."

In the same book of evidence appear piteous letters written by some of the victims themselves, showing how miserably they have been deluded, and how difficult—to some of the weaker absolutely impossible—is the chance of escape.

But in speaking of woman's degradation, let us not shut our eyes to the general condition of society. There is other degradation besides that which obtrudes itself in the streets. Those who mix much with the world mourn over a general laxity of tone which seems to be permitted —conversation of a loose and suggestive kind; theatrical performances, taken from the free and immoral literature of France; that which some years ago would have been scouted, now witnessed and enjoyed; French novels, where evil is freely set forth and spoken of as good, read even by young girls growing into womanhood; men encouraged, sometimes even by mothers, whose lives are notoriously profligate; the tie of marriage no hindrance to dangerous intimacies, sometimes not falling short of gross and flagrant sin. If this is not degradation of women, it is difficult to say what it is. Or, again, what can be said of those women who so completely cast aside the modesty of their sex as to write books teeming with voluptuous description or the worst form of masculine slang?

What, then, can be done to stem this tide of evil, of immorality and female degradation; to maintain the woman in her true position of usefulness and honour?

I am speaking to men, and to them I say, in the first place, that I believe that in a very great degree the condition of women depends on ourselves. Women will ever be that which men desire and esteem them to be. If men show reverence and respect for women, women will feel respect for themselves. "The man," says Coleridge, "desires the woman. The woman desires that the man shall desire her." The woman, according to the very condition of her being, seeks to be sought. "*Fugit ad salices, et se cupit ante videri.*" If, then, man sees in the woman a mere

plaything, an object for amusement, or, still worse, merely a means of gratifying his lower passions, she will soon become this. Her instinct of affection is so strong that she will too often give herself, body, soul, and spirit, to the man whom she loves, if only she can please him and bind him to herself. For his sake she will cast all aside, forget her own people and her father's house; even yield herself, without being lustful, to his lust. This then is, as I think, what is needed first of all: to cultivate in ourselves, and so far as may be in others, the sense of woman's nobility; the cruelty, the brutality of all that tends to mar it, such as loose conversation, light badinage, the presuming on her love; to resolve in every way to preserve and to defend her, as the weaker vessel, against those who would treat her amiss. And I cannot but rejoice that in our Universities, in London, and elsewhere, societies of men have been formed, on reasonable and sober principles, for the maintenance of purity, which, adopting a few simple rules, and bound together by the tie of prayer, may disseminate true and religious views as to the sanctity of the other sex. To these I would ask the attention of my hearers, and invite them to enroll themselves among them.

But, over and above this general duty of men to women, there are, I think, several steps to be taken to save them from the dangers which beset their life. I confess that as a general rule, I am not an advocate for the interference of the State where human liberty is concerned. I am not sure that in some matters we have not gone, and are not going too far. It is the conscience which needs awakening.

"Quid leges, sine moribus vanæ, proficiunt."

Yet there is a limit even to this. Where it can be clearly shown that superior intelligence, strength, opportunity, and craftiness are made use of to entrap the simple and ignorant to their utter destruction; when it is the young and practically helpless against whom the machinations of these fiends of both sexes are directed, then, as I think, we may fairly, nay, are bound to, incite the law to come to their defence and rescue. It is most important that all who have this matter at heart should realise the present state of things.

How stands the law at this present time?—

(1) Any woman, being over twenty-one years, may be decoyed—"procured" for evil purposes—by any fraud or false pretence.

(2) Any girl over the age of sixteen may be taken out of the possession of her parents, even against their will, unless possessed of property.

(3) Any girl over thirteen may be seduced without penal consequences following to the seducer, unless it can be shown that some one has been injured who had a claim to her services.

(4) Any master employing a girl may seduce her with impunity, unless it can be shown, which is very difficult indeed, that he has actually committed a rape upon her.

(5) Any girl over sixteen may be concealed in a brothel, while her parents have no power to enter the house to search for her.

(6) Any man may solicit a girl for evil purposes, though at least according to the theory of the law, a woman may not solicit a man.

Obviously, then, the protection of our women against outrage is, so far

as the law is concerned, of the weakest possible kind. With us it is actually less than in the other countries of Europe, and the result has been, first of all, the hideous traffic of which I have just spoken, and next a continual increase of juvenile prostitution, which has at last, however tardily, attracted the attention of at least the Upper House of the Legislature. An important Bill was introduced into the House of Lords in the last session of Parliament, in which it was proposed to deal firmly, though reasonably, with this matter; to extend the protection of the law to women generally; to bring the law to bear on the keepers of bad houses—a most important movement; more sharply to define the crime of soliciting; and, what is perhaps most important of all, to enable magistrates to send to a certified industrial home girls under sixteen having no proper guardianship or residing in houses frequented for evil purposes. This Bill was earnestly debated, amended, passed, and hopes were greatly raised; but, alas! after all nothing came of it. I have received the following statement from Mr. Benjamin Scott, the City Chamberlain, who has given much time and labour to the subject. "The law as to abduction of girls for evil purposes has not been altered. The Bill introduced into the House of Lords last session, called 'The Criminal Law Amendment Bill' was so mutilated, that, when it reached the Commons, it was withdrawn, and the law remains as before." I fear that a charge must be laid against our legislators of lack of earnestness in this important matter, and I venture to urge on all here present so to stir the question in their respective spheres of influence in the only manner which seems to be effectual—that is, by continual agitation—as to make action an imperative necessity with those who look to us for support.

But, apart from legislation, there is no need to fold our hands and give up effort in despair. Much good and helpful work lies within the reach of all. Consider the question of dwelling-houses. If anyone will give the least heed to the wretched hovels and lodgments in which millions of our people live, he will marvel, I think, not at the amount of vice and corruption to be found among them, but that their condition is not even worse. Every town of any size has in its streets back regions, *cul de sac* courts full of miserable houses yielding high profits to their owners, but stuffy, dirty, often with but one room below and another above for father and mother, boys and girls, without any arrangement made for the commonest decency or decorum, where each is of necessity exposed to hear the ribaldry and filthy songs in which any choose to indulge. And thus, whereas in a higher class of life if evil enters, it must have been encouraged and invited, *here* coarseness and impurity are the atmosphere in which children live. I believe that no truer philanthropy can be shown than in a real, self-sacrificing effort to gain possession of the dwellings of the poor, and make them, so far as cleanliness and propriety of arrangement are concerned, such as we would ourselves inhabit. I *know*, too, that this can be done by a comparatively moderate outlay of time and means.

Then, next, consider the condition of our schools. I am convinced that more precaution is needed in regard to these than for the most part we find to be exercised. The sexual instinct is of very early development, and—I speak from sad and actual knowledge—irreparable mischief may be committed by children before the conscience is fairly

awakened to discern evil from good. Large mixed schools, where boys and girls are brought into close contact, under the charge, it may be, of a young master fresh from a training college, with lads as pupil teachers, cannot fail to turn out girls with minds coarsened and made ready for future evil. A small tract, entitled "A Few Words to Schoolmistresses," published by Hatchard, may with great advantage be placed in the hands of teachers, with reiterated warnings not to live in what is called a fool's paradise, but to be watchful and even suspicious of every approach to familiarity between boys and girls.

Once more, let it be remembered that there is in the life of most girls of the class to which I refer a specially critical time. Between the leaving school and the going out into the regular work of life—that is, for the most part between the ages of twelve and fifteen or sixteen—it is often very difficult to place them safely out. Employers of the better kind decline to hire them, and thus they often linger on at home, or accept a low and often very dangerous kind of situation. I believe that there are greatly needed to meet *this* case, as well as that of those who are called "rough girls," moderately-sized industrial schools in every neighbourhood, where girls may be received for about two years, and well nurtured and trained; well instructed in the principles of their religion, taught to pray, to respect themselves, to believe in and to love God, confirmed and made regular communicants; and then, and not till then, sent out to fight the battle of life. I speak again from my own experience, and I know what can in this way be done, how from such an institution, there may be sent forth year after year, a stream of high-toned, high-principled girls, capable and trustworthy as servants, and, so far as is possible to human nature, raised into a condition of thought and feeling in which they recoil with horror from all that is unmaidenly or impure.

Closely, again, connected with this last suggestion is the actual employment of women. It is, I think, a matter of real rejoicing that so many callings are now opened to women which have been closed to them. Telegraph and Post-office clerkships, the writing for lawyers or men of business, the mixing of drugs for chemists, the study of medicine for the benefit of their own sex—these and such as these are what women may, as I think, without impropriety undertake. And the more these are multiplied—the more that women are incited to that which encourages and demands propriety of demeanour and self-respect, and which provides a fair means of living—the more will woman be freed from the danger which so grievously besets her life.

All these influences are outside of legal enactments; we can carry them out ourselves. And I cannot help thinking that as things now are, considering the vast and somewhat provoking variety of opinions, the love of paradox with some, the cynical recklessness of others, the distaste which many feel to handle a painful subject, and the general crowd of measures which overwhelm and paralyse the action of Parliament, we should do well to make use as much as possible of our own resources, while at the same time, we should lose no opportunity of rousing public feeling to take woman's side, and of ameliorating and strengthening those laws which regulate the intercourse between the two sexes.

And then, as the last, if we, as clergy, speaking to mixed congregations, must handle such subjects in the pulpit with a discretion and

forbearance which somewhat dulls the edge of that which is said, there is, at least, no reason why in private conversation we all, both clergy and laity, should not speak freely and boldly; point out especially to those who are growing into manhood the cruelty and brutal selfishness of that vice which degrades woman; and bid men, before they lay evil hands on that which is loveliest, holiest, most capable of diffusing happiness of all God's creatures upon earth, pause to ask themselves the solemn question, "How can I do this great wickedness and sin against God?"

Admiral A. P. Ryder.

Note.—The XIV. Appendices referred to in this paper have not been attached to it, as some of them are not yet completed. The paper will shortly be reprinted complete. Information can be obtained regarding it at the Church of England Purity Office, No. 111, Palace Chambers, Bridge Street, Westminster.

The branch of the above subject to which I have been requested to direct your attention is the second, viz.: the *Prevention of the Degradation of Women and Children.* The Rev. Dr. Ridding and the Rev. Mr. Lyttelton, have read Papers on "Purity," and the Rev. Canon Butler, of Worcester, has dwelt upon this second branch from many most important points of view. Our division of the subject fitly follows that of "Purity"—for one of the results of Impurity is the Degradation of Women and Children.

In the short—necessarily short—space of time (twenty minutes) allowed to "readers," I do not think I can do better than imagine that some among you have asked me these questions:—1. What, up to the present time, has been done by the *State* to prevent the Degradation of Women and Children? What did the present Government attempt, and failed to do, last Session? What may we hope will be effected before long?

2. What, up to the present time, has been done by the *Church* to prevent the Degradation of Women and Children? What is the Church attempting to do now? What may we hope will be effected before long.

3. What can Individuals do?

First. *What, up to the present time, has been done by the State to prevent the Degradation of Women and Children? What did the present Government attempt, and failed to do, last Session, What may we hope will be affected before long?* Until within the last forty years, very little was *directly* done by the State. We find in the Statute Books certain laws which would appear to be calculated to prevent the Degradation of Women, but the working was assumed to be so difficult, that numerous brothels were and are still to be found in almost all towns of any size, and it is only within the last few years that the residents of certain towns—Edinburgh, Glasgow, Manchester, Leeds, and others—awoke to the fact, that by banding themselves together into Vigilance Committees, they could either so work the existing laws, as in the case of Manchester (or by aid of local "Acts," as at Edinburgh and Glasgow), as to repress the open promenading the streets by prostitutes, etc., and shut up a large majority of the brothels. In a paper I hold in my hand, published by Hatchard, entitled the "Glasgow System for the Repression of Vice," the method adopted is explained, and at pages 5 and 8 it

is stated that "in Glasgow, after nine years of vigorous measures required by the citizens, the brothels were reduced to less than *one-seventh* of the original number," and "order and decency are maintained in the streets," "while there is no complaint from any respectable citizen that prostitution has gone into more secret or private channels, or that the repressive measures of the authorities have inflicted the slightest hardship upon any one." Glasgow, I should state, has never been under the Contagious Diseases Acts. Dr. Acton estimated some few years back that there were 80,000 (eighty thousand) women in London who were living there on the wages of vice. If London parishes promptly followed in the path of these Northern towns, might we not hope for an equally good result, and if not, why not? and why should not all the towns lately "protected" by the Contagious Diseases Acts—Portsmouth, Plymouth, Chatham, etc.—follow the same course, instead of merely protesting against the Government action, and complaining, as they are doing now, of the rapid rise in the number of Military and Naval Hospital cases, and the as rapid fall in the number of female Lock Ward cases, and yet neither closing their brothels nor taking the girls under fourteen out of them. *

The greatest defect, however, in the action of the State as represented by the Common Law of England, lies in the inadequate protection it affords the young. The law against seduction affords no protection to a child over thirteen! and neither that nor the abduction laws afford any protection against the deeper evil of "prostitution," or against those who trade in the inexperience and ignorance of the young. The Common Law of most continental countries makes the debauching of minors up to twenty-one an indictable offence, and subjects those who harbour minors for improper purposes to heavy fines and imprisonment. This does not exist in the Common Law of England, nor does it find a place in the Criminal Law Amendment Bill, as it passed the House of Lords last Session. Hence the rapid growth of the corruption of the young in England. The abduction laws in England are very limited in their application, viz.: (1.) To a child taken out of the custody of its lawful guardians, not to a girl who has no guardians; (2.) They do not apply to a girl over thirteen, except when the girl is an heiress, and then she is protected until twenty-one; (3.) The laws do not apply to a girl who runs off, *e.g.*, abducts herself, the usual form of taking to the streets. In France the law gives parents or guardians absolute control over girls until twenty-one.

In my evidence before the Committee of Convocation on Prostitution in 1881,† I summed up the offences against Purity which at present

---

* If the statements from Glasgow, etc., are doubted, it would be very easy to send some competent person to investigate.

† APPENDIX B, p. 23.—(*o*) If we are asked whether we believe that we are within an appreciable distance of an Act of the Legislature making sexual intercourse other than between married persons a misdemeanour, we reply that we hope we are; but in any case we believe we shall be much nearer within reach of such an Act if we maintain the legal grip we now have on immoral offences, for remember that[1] (1) *the grosser forms of immorality are illegal;* (2) *adultery is illegal;* (3) *incest is illegal;* (4) *brothels are illegal*, although the law is, alas! rarely put in force; (5) by the Contagious Disease Acts (not yet repealed, but practically suspended), prostitution

1 Even *swearing and making use of obscene language* are *illegal*, and it may be noticed in police reports that persons are punished for these even when they are unaccompanied by any other offence.

involve *legal* consequences, and I deprecated the loosening the hold that the law at present has on many infringers of the Statutes affecting Purity.

When the scandalous outrages committed in Belgium by "procurers," who traded in girls from England, were exposed, a Committee of the House of Lords was appointed to consider the law relating to the protection of young girls, and report.

I have printed the recommendations contained in their Report in Appendix I., and with it, in Appendix II., a summary of the Bill introduced by the Government to carry out the recommendations of the Lords Committee; and I have pointed out the mutilations which the Government Bill underwent in the House of Lords. Shortly after the Bill reached the House of Commons the Prime Minister announced that it was one of the Bills that would be withdrawn, but he gave no special reasons. It is earnestly to be hoped that the Bill will be re-introduced early in next Session, and that its supporters in the House of Lords, if it be introduced in that House, will re-insert the valuable clauses that were either mutilated or suppressed, *especially those designed to facilitate the closing of brothels.* The responsibility incurred by all persons actively concerned in the mutilation of the Bill in the House of Lords, and in its final withdrawal, is very great. Many a poor girl now on the streets might have been rescued; many a sink of iniquity closed, had that Government Bill become law.

I hold in my hand a very valuable paper entitled "Proposed Amendment of the Law relating to the Protection of Minors." Copies may be obtained on application to the Honorary Secretaries of the Minors' Protection Joint Committee, 3, New Court, Lincoln's Inn, W.C.

This Committee, which comprises representatives of most of the leading institutions and societies in London having for their object the protection and rescue of women and girls, was formed early in the year 1882, to watch and aid the introduction of the Government Bill alluded to above, and to awaken public interest in the matter. A mere list of the headings of this paper will be sufficient for me to read here.*

---

involves *legal* consequences in the direction of *suppression*, viz., *registration, examination, seclusion if diseased;* (6) sexual intercourse with girls under twelve is *felony;* (7) with girls over twelve and under thirteen is a *misdemeanour;* (8) to harbour girls under fourteen in a brothel is now, thanks to Miss Hopkins, *illegal;* (9) rape is a felony. It will be noticed that 5, 7, and 8 are modern enactments.

(*p*) We contend that the tide of public opinion is setting in the direction we advocate, and we look forward hopefully to the time when (5) the Contagious Disease Acts may be repealed or largely modified, as a consequence of putting (4) the laws against brothels more rigidly in force, and the amendment, from time to time, of (7) and (8), by increasing the ages.

(*q*) We deprecate, therefore, the tampering with any stone in the arch of repressive legislation.

* Summary of Paper C issued by the Minors' Protection Joint Committee.

The existing provisions of the criminal law for the protection of young persons from immoral practices, and suggested improvements with the view of extending that protection.

I.—Provisions of the existing criminal law:—

1. That intercourse with girls under 12, even with consent, is felony; if between 12 and 13, it is a misdemeanour.
2. Indecent assault is a crime; the consent of person assaulted under 13 is no defence.

I have told you what it is important you should know as to what the State has done and what the present Government has tried and has unaccountably failed to effect; but you, each of you, may do much to help the Government to pass this Bill next Session.

I purposely—and at the request of the authorities of the Congress—omit any controversial allusions to the Contagious Diseases Acts. They are inoperative at present; there is a truce for a time between their supporters and their opponents. I may state, however, that the most earnest of the *leaders* on both sides lose no opportunity of giving full credit to the motives of their opponents as being, however mistaken, as pure and as conscientious as their own.

SECOND.—What has the *Church done—is doing—what may and should she do—to prevent the degradation of women and children?* In speaking of what the Church has done in the cause of purity and to prevent the degradation of women and children, I need do no more than allude to its constant protest for the last nineteen centuries against this vice, in its services and in its teaching. When the Church considered that purity was attacked by legislative action—as, for instance, in alterations of the marriage law; in the facilitating of divorces, etc.—the Church, represented by the Bishops in the House of Lords, by Convocation, and from thousands of pulpits, in scores of books, from the ponderous tome to the lightest pamphlet, lifted up its voice in reprobation, and it is as ready to do so now as heretofore; but if the number of the houses of mercy and of refuge opened for the rescue and reformation of fallen women is to be considered as a measure of the interest taken in promoting purity, not much can be said for the Church of England until

---

3. Abduction of girls under 16 from care of parents or guardians is a misdemeanour. Fraudulent abduction of girls under 21, entitled to property, is felony.
4. Procuring by fraud any girl under 21 to have illicit intercourse is a misdemeanour.
5. Conspiracy to cause immorality or indecency is punishable at common law.
6. Rape, and attempt at rape, are crimes.

II.—Principles on which these laws depend :—

(*a.*) That while vice is not a crime, there is a limit of age (13) below which the girl is considered as incapable of giving her consent, so that the offending party is guilty of criminal injury.

(*b.*) That girls having parents or guardians, or possessed of property, should have more protection than those without.

III.—Six principles, A, B, C, D, E, F, underlying the proposed amendments of the law. *See* Paper C, App. III.

IV.—The proposed amendments :—

First.—To make penal immorality or indecency with any girl under 18.

Secondly.—To make penal immorality or indecency with any girl under 21, if committed by her father, guardian, master, or other person in authority over her.

Thirdly.—To make it penal for a third party to procure, promote, aid, or abet immorality with any young person under 21.

Fourthly.—To enable the magistrate, on satisfactory evidence of reasonable suspicion, to authorise search to be made for minors detained in houses for immoral purposes (of whom there are believed to be a very large number), or for minors frequenting such houses for those purposes.

Fifthly.—To enable the magistrate, in cases where the girl invites the offence, to punish her, or to deal with her by requiring securities for good behaviour, or by reformatory treatment.

V.—Difficulties and objections stated and dealt with exhaustively.

VI.—Boys should be protected.

VII.—The general law as to suppression of bad houses and solicitation in the streets is not dealt with in this paper.

Bishop Armstrong inaugurated the Church Penitentiary Association in 1852. In Appendix IV. is a table framed from extracts from its last report, 1882, which shows what is being done by houses of mercy and houses of refuge in union with the Church Penitentiary Association.

That old and wealthy foundation, the Magdalen, Streatham (see Appendix V. for extracts from its last report), founded in 1780, has for many years afforded accommodation to about 100 penitents. But London has, at least, five times as many inhabitants now as it had in 1780, and the Magdalen institutions of this metropolis, with its over 3,000,000 inhabitants, if they are to follow the growth of the city (and its rapidly increasing suburbs), which they were founded principally to benefit, should (unless vice becomes much less rampant) hold over 1,000 penitents instead of 100. There are other houses of mercy for London (see the list of London Charities *). The Magdalen, Streatham, is well deserving a visit. (I speak as one of the General Committee.) The income of its invested property makes it almost independent of subscription lists. It has been hoped by some of its well-wishers that the governing body might see their way to doubling the number of inmates by erecting another Magdalen on the other side of London, and, if necessary, appealing to the public for aid to maintain both. Many persons who prefer, for whatever reason, "management" by paid matrons instead of by sisters, would welcome this opportunity for aiding a house managed, since its commencement, by paid matrons. The Albion Hill Home at Brighton has been admirably managed for many years by matrons, under Mrs. Vicar's able supervision.

Previous to the formation of the Church Penitentiary Association in 1852, there were some refuges here and there in the different dioceses, and the Lock Hospital in London acted as a refuge; but it was not until shortly before Bishop Armstrong's movement, which led to the creation of the Church Penitentiary Association, that Clewer was started, now a noble institution with over 100 sisters, and housing over 80 penitents. Clewer is also the mother of numerous works of mercy, orphanages, hospital, etc.—see Appendix IX. for extracts from its last report, as also extracts, with a drawing of the house, from the last report of the Home at Basingstoke, which will soon be completed for 77 penitents. This last house was the first Church Penitentiary Association Home to adopt the "cottage" principle on a large scale—only eleven or twelve penitents in each cottage. A "sister" and an assistant reside in each cottage, and are in charge of the dormitory. The "sister" occupies a bedroom with full command of the dormitory, and the assistant occupies a cubicle in the dormitory. Gas is always turned on in the dormitory; the "sister" from her bed controls the light. Each cottage has its own garden. The girls can be easily classified in a home on the cottage principle, and kept more easily under control and from having unlimited intercourse with other penitents.

Miss Sellon's Sisterhood at Devonport, warmly supported by the well-known Bishop of Exeter (Henry Philpotts), was formed in 1859, and devoted itself at once to penitentiary work. Since that time, when in 1852 Bishop Armstrong, then rector of Tidenham, called the Church Penitentiary Association together, numerous sisterhoods have been

* Low's "Handbook to the Charities of London." Sampson Low & Co., Fleet Street.

formed; and most of them aid in preventive and rescue work, and carry on various other charitable objects. I have already alluded to Appendix IV., a table compiled from the last report of the Church Penitentiary Association, giving under various headings very interesting information about the houses of mercy and the refuges in union with it. I have arranged (and this is now done for the first time) the various houses according to the dioceses and alphabetically. It will be seen that while some dioceses appear to be thoroughly aroused, and to have numerous houses—either penitentaries or refuges, or both—other dioceses appear to be either doing nothing, or, if at work, then their doing good in this direction is so secretly effected that I have been foiled in all attempts to ascertain the what, the where, the when. You will observe that the Church Penitentiary Association has one or more associates in every English diocese. *Liverpool*,* with over 1,000,000 *inhabitants*, and *Newcastle*,* with 438,707 *inhabitants*, have lately been separated from Chester and Durham, and do not as yet show their distinct list of associates of the Church Penitentiary Association. *Sodor and Man*, with 54,089 *inhabitants*, appears to have no resident associate of the Church Penitentiary Association. I regret to say that, although there is only one out of the thirty-two dioceses that has *no* associates resident in it, there are fifteen dioceses out of the thirty-two that have no houses of mercy or of refuge in union with the Church Penitentiary Association, and only eighteen out of the thirty-two have organising secretaries. You may say, and not unnaturally, that "I am concealing something from you (unintentionally, of course), and that if not houses in connection with the Church Penitentiary Association, there must be other houses—English Church houses, or Roman Church houses, or Nonconformist houses—which have escaped my notice." Well, to prepare myself to answer this question and remove this suspicion, I wrote to organising secretaries or associates in all the thirty-two dioceses, including the fifteen dioceses that had no houses of mercy or of refuge in connection with the Church Penitentiary Association, and asked them these three questions :—

Questions accompanying a letter from Admiral A. P. Ryder, and a copy of the Preliminary Report of the Church of England Purity Society, addressed to the Organising Secretaries (or to a Member of the Church Penitentiary Association if there were no Organising Secretary), in each of the thirty-two English Dioceses. *August*, 1883.

1. What *houses of mercy* and what *houses of refuge*, or other houses having similar objects, besides those in union with the Church Penitentiary Association, are open and at work in your diocese?

(*a*) Any information about the religious denomination of the above houses—whether Church of England, Nonconformist, or Roman Catholic—the good they effect, the size, number of inmates, income, etc., will be welcome.

(*b*) Copies of latest reports will be welcome.

* *Liverpool* and *Newcastle* are newly created dioceses. The associates of the Church Penitentiary Association residing in them are still credited to Chester and Durham; they will doubtless soon feel the necessity of having their houses of mercy and refuges in union with the Church Penitentiary Association separate and distinct from those of Chester and Durham.

2. In your opinion, would the visit of a deputation from the council of the new *Church of England Purity Society* to attend your next *Diocesan Synod* or *Conference*, your archidiaconal or ruridecanal meetings, tend to create an interest, or intensify it if it already exists, in the *general* work of the new society, and in the *special* work of the Church Penitentiary Association?

3. Can you suggest any other course which, if adopted by the new society, would, in your opinion, promote its objects?

The answers from the fifteen dioceses summarised were as follows:—That nothing was known, except in two dioceses, of any special efforts by Nonconformist bodies for the rescue of penitents, etc.; that opportunities would be taken advantage of to bring this important question before the Diocesan Conferences, etc., and that deputations from London advocating the movement in favour of *local* preventive and curative work, would in most cases be welcome. In Appendix XIII. will be found the names of all houses from the list given every month in "Seeking and Saving," including many besides those in union with the Church Penitentiary Association. There is ample room for many more homes under all the widely different systems. We wish God speed to all.

It would appear, therefore, that in many of the fifteen dioceses where the Church Penitentiary Association has as yet gained no footing practically little or nothing is being done, with few exceptions. Occasionally a Diocesan Church Penitentiary may be so conveniently placed (the Church Penitentiary at Stone, Kent, is an instance) as to receive penitents from neighbouring dioceses, but there is not a single diocese—except perhaps Sodor and Man—which would not (sad as it is to say so) keep one house of mercy for 80 penitents quite full, which if they stay on an average two years (and the Sisters and Chaplain rarely feel hopeful if they remain a less time), means the reception of only 40 per year, or only about *three* per month!!

The Church Penitentiary Association, under the guidance of Bishop Armstrong, availed itself, in 1852, of the great sisterhood movement just starting into life in the English Church, and by a fundamental statute confined its efforts to aiding *houses of mercy* managed by *self-devoted* women, but did not extend this to its houses of temporary refuge.* The Church Penitentiary Association has done a noble work, but in a struggle nearly equal in length to the famous Thirty Years War, it has only gained about *half* the dioceses, 17 out of 32, and in many of them has only a very slight footing—a single fort held with difficulty. To what is this slow progress owing? I believe—but in saying this I speak without in the slightest degree committing my coadjutors on the Council of the Church Penitentiary Association—I believe it is owing partly to a mistake, a most natural mistake, in our original Regulations which has hampered our every attempt to step forward *rapidly*—a

* In defining "self-devotion" the Council of the Church Penitentiary Association has not attempted to give a *positive* definition, but has *negatively* ruled that houses of mercy are not excluded from "union" and from aid because women engaged in the management receive pecuniary assistance from the funds of the house, provided it be only for their journeys to and fro, and their maintenance while absent for relaxation. Food, clothing, and medical attendance are also offered free to the women whose "services" in the management of the houses are "unpaid." Many of these ladies contribute largely to the erection and support of the houses.

mistake which has been wisely avoided by the Church Temperance Society, and will, I hope, be avoided by the Church of England Purity Society (only inaugurated in May of this year at Lambeth Palace), and of which Society I shall speak presently.

Rule II. of the Regulations of the Church Penitentiary Association appears to impose on it the duty of not merely assisting to *build*, but also in assisting to *maintain*, all the various Church penitentiaries and houses of refuge it has assisted to establish, provided they apply for aid, have complied with the regulations, and show an expenditure in excess of their receipts. The Council, loyal to the Regulations framed principally by their good founder, Bishop Armstrong, whose memory we all revere, have faithfully adhered in their practice to this interpretation of the Regulations, and year by year spend largely in aiding to *maintain* institutions fully grown up.* There is a "resolution" in the minute book of the Church Penitentiary Association to the effect that the *opening of new houses* has a higher claim on the resources of the Church Penitentiary Association than continued assistance in the *maintenance of old houses;* but this has not yet resulted in any vigorous inroad into the fifteen *silent* dioceses. I prefer to style them *silent* than by any other adjective, such as "indolent," "dilatory," "negligent," or "blind," which might give offence; moreover, I am still in hopes that after this paper has reached the *silent* regions, if it ever penetrates so far, I may be inundated with reproachful letters insisting on my apologising in the *Guardian* or the *Record* for my libel on them, proving that unknown to me and to my local correspondents (the resident Organising Secretaries or Associates of the Church Penitentiary Association), there are flourishing houses of Mercy and Refuges in all or most of these dioceses; meanwhile, I trust the Council of the Church Penitentiary Association may see its way to send, with permission of the bishops, pioneers into the *silent* dioceses, and also to passing a "resolution" such as we find in the Church Temperance Society, and that then the diocesan branches (in this case the Committees of the Diocesan Penitentiaries) will proceed to reverse the present system, and commence in gratitude for past aid, to help the Central Society with funds to assist in starting new houses instead of continuing to drain it. The different circumstances of the two societies—the Church Penitentiary Association and the Church of England Temperance Society—necessitate, perhaps, different arrangements. If however a "resolution" were adopted by the Church Penitentiary Association that only under very exceptional circumstances would more than say *five* annual grants, dating from the first grant, be made for *maintenance* to each house of mercy or refuge, and if this rule came into action in twelve months from now, sufficient money would be available to help more freely the younger houses and pay the expenses of the pioneers which I have just suggested should be sent to the *silent* dioceses by the Church Penitentiary Association, with permission of their bishops.

I have mentioned the new Church Society entitled the Church of England Purity Society, inaugurated on 25th May of this year at Lambeth, at a meeting assembled under the presidency and with the hearty sympathy of the Archbishop of Canterbury. It consisted of

* Some few of the houses do not apply for aid.

over 500 men, invited as representative persons, of whom about 300 notified that they would join the Society as members after hearing the speeches of His Grace the Primate, of other Bishops, and of eminent laymen.

The new Society has printed a statement,* entitled "The Preliminary Report of the Executive Committee," price 6*d.*, which contains a short history of the movement which led up to its creation, develops its scheme of action, sketches the machinery by which it proposes to work; and, while calling itself the *Church of England Purity Society* for promoting the following five objects, viz. :—

1. Purity among Men.
2. A Chivalrous Respect for Womanhood.
3. The Preservation of the Young from Contamination.
4. Rescue Work.
5. A Higher Tone of Public Opinion:

expresses a wish to work on terms of friendly union with all Societies or Associations having similar objects, and of affiliating such Societies as desire to have that tie. The members of the *Council* are by its constitution men in full communion with the Church of England; its ordinary members need not belong to the Church of England, but membership is confined to men over 18.†

The table, Appendix IV., gives in its first three columns useful information about the new Society's work, and shows at a glance that, with only one exception, every English Bishop has taken it by the hand.

I think I shall just have time to read to you a list of points which the Council of the Church of England Purity Society propose to consider, and for which they are indebted to their friend and Lady Referee, Miss Ellice Hopkins, arranged under *four* headings. *See* App. VII., B.

I think you will say that this ground is wide enough to frighten any young Society, but the Council, encouraged by their President, the Archbishop of Canterbury, intends to take courage and grapple one by one with all the four groups—by aid of Special Sub-Committees and Assistant Secretaries—unless it finds them already in good hands, when aid will be given ungrudgingly.

The Four Divisions of Work that it has been suggested might be undertaken by the Church of England Purity Society (see the List at p. 3—6 of the Preliminary Report of the Executive Committee of the Church of England Purity Society).

I.—In the grave question of "*Education, with the view of raising*

* The Church of England Purity Society has also issued a *Summary* of the preliminary report, price 1*d.*, and a leaflet A, price 1*s.* per twelve dozen copies, or 1*d.* for ten (see Appendix VI.).

† Eighteen was selected as the minimum age for *Membership* of the Central Society, for the following reasons—because it is the age at which lads from schools join the *Universities*, the *Army*, the *Medical Profession*, the *Civil Service*, *Commercial Offices*, *etc.*, and it was thought advisable that whatever assistance membership of the Church of England Purity Society could give, be it great or small, should be offered to these young men at the threshold of that freer life at college, etc., when special temptations to excess were first encountered, and when there might be no local branch or affiliated society, This in answer to those who think eighteen is too young. To those who consider that lads much younger than eighteen should have been allowed to enter the Central Society, it may suffice to know that this question was carefully considered, and it was decided unanimously that they might join *branches* as Associates, but not the *Central* Society.

public opinion as regards purity," the Society hopes to be aided by Miss Ellice Hopkins, and their other Lady Referees, and *especially among men*, by the heads of colleges, also by the head masters of schools, and by medical men. I give, in Appendix VII., a list of various publications, chiefly by Miss Ellice Hopkins, including the *White Cross* series for men (Hatchard), also, in Appendix VIII., of the numerous books and pamphlets sold by the Social Purity Alliance, and if it be considered advisable the Church of England Purity Society will no doubt add to the number.

II.—With regard to *Promoting Legislative and Legal Action, both general and municipal*, the "Minors' Protection Society" well occupies a portion of the ground, and Miss Ellice Hopkins has with great success visited nearly every large town in England, Wales and Scotland with the above object. The new Church Society will certainly be much more anxious to help than to interfere with this good work. It will probably appoint a Special Committee of men learned in the law to advise the Council on this matter, and confer with the Committee of the Society for amending the Law for the Protection of Minors.

III.—*Preventive Work*, in many of its aspects the most important, will engage the most anxious consideration of the Council. In this department more than in any other the Council will no doubt look for and obtain aid from their Lady Referees—one of whom has devoted her whole life to this special branch. To quote an instance of what one individual can, by zeal and devotion, effect, I may mention the Amendment of the Industrial Schools Act, which Miss Ellice Hopkins, after three years, succeeded in persuading the Government to adopt—(see Appendix X.) In attempting to work this "Amendment," I warn you by my own experience at Portsmouth, that grave difficulties will have to be surmounted—(see Appendix XI.) A Vigilance Committee should appoint itself in every town to carry out this Amendment with a high hand.

IV.—With regard to *Curative Work*, a wide field opens out before the new Society, The Church Penitentiary Association has for over 30 years been diligent in aiding to spread a network of houses of mercy and of refuges over the land. The new society hopes to be able to aid the Church Penitentiary Association largely. Other houses on other systems exist and flourish, and will not be overlooked. This new Church Society might usefully investigate, with permission of the different authorities, the results of the various systems. Visits which would be resented from outsiders might be welcomed from a deputation of the Church of England Society for Promoting Purity and Preventing the Degradation of Women and Children, and much good to the great work would be gained.

Among other results of such a visit might be this, viz., a collection and comparison of the statutes of the different sisterhoods, with permission of the sisters.

It would not be impossible that, from these, model statutes might be formed, which, like those framed for the important Diocesan Church Penitentiary at Basingstoke (by Samuel, Bishop of Winchester), would at the same time satisfy the most cautious (and rightly cautious) of bishops, while it left to the sisterhood all the freedom of self-government, including the selection of their Lady Superior, etc., that the most

independent (and to a certain point rightly independent) of sisterhoods could wish.

Problems of great importance are awaiting solution in reference to *Curative* work—for instance, self-supporting Industrial Homes for those penitents, a large number, who are physically strong but morally, if not mentally, weak, and very liable to "fall" again; also homes for those who are morally and mentally strong, but physically weak, and unable to earn their livelihood. All these, one at least of each kind in each diocese, ought to be started. The first class of Home might, with care, be made so remunerative, if only able-bodied girls are admitted, as to be able to support the others.

But time would fail me if I attempted to enter at large into the various topics, which branch out from these two divisions of the work—the *Preventive* and the *Curative*. Take one instance of individual work, the Friendless Girls' Association, the creation of Miss Ellice Hopkins, which occupies, and most usefully, ground not covered by the Girls' Friendly Society.

Seventy-two of these Associations now exist (Oct., 1883), covering to a considerable extent the same ground among *women* as that proposed for the Church of England Purity Society among *men*. A list of these Associations, with their Secretaries, and the Preventive and Rescue Agencies they have founded, can be referred to in "*Seeking and Saving*" (Skeffington).*

THIRD.—I said when I commenced that I would assume that some of you had asked me several questions which I enumerated.

I have endeavoured to answer two of them, and now if any of you, or of the readers of this paper, wish to ask what you can *individually* do to help this cause, I would say decide in your own mind, *first*, to pray for its success, and also on what you can afford to give as a *donation* now, and annually as a *subscription*, to this great work. Divide each donation and subscription into two equal portions; give one portion of each to such *Preventive* works as may recommend themselves to you, and the other portions among the following *Curative* works:—

1. The Church of England Purity Society, Office, 111, Palace Chambers, Bridge Street, Westminster, of which you should, if eligible, become a Member; which, however, does not confine itself to encouraging *Curative* work.

2. The Church Pentitentiary Association, Office, 14, York Buildings, Adelphi, of which you should, if eligible, become an Associate.

3. The Church Penitentiary or House of Mercy in your diocese, of which you should become an Associate, and, if your diocese has hitherto been *silent*, endeavour to make it articulate.

4. The House of Refuge in your nearest town, and, if there be none, then agitate until one is opened.

5. If you reside in London, the "Mission to the Fallen" may well hope to receive a portion of your alms. Letters may be addressed to Colonel Shortt, S. Agnes Hospital, Margaret Street, W.

* "Seeking and Saving" (Skeffington), a monthly serial, edited by the Rev. V. G. Borradaile, Curate of St. Mary Magdalene, Munster Square, gives most useful information to all engaged in rescue and in preventive work. I hope it will be adopted as their organ for conveying useful information (monthly) to their members by the Church of England Purity Society, and to their Associates by the Church Penitentiary Association. It deserves every encouragement.

If you do this and read their periodical reports carefully, and pray for their success daily, you will soon feel that enthusiastic desire to help more and more, which seems providentially to be developed in all persons that *earnestly* take it up.

I have left to the very last a few remarks on a most important point.

FINAL.—No one can feel more strongly than does the Council of the new Society the great and special difficulties and dangers in their path.*

But what, you may ask, are the *dangers* and *difficulties* I have referred to? I can best illustrate my meaning by pointing out a marked difference between these two Societies, one, the C.E.T.S. (the Church of England Temperance Society), the other, the C.E.P.S. (the Church of England Purity Society). The members of even the youngest of the Associations of the Church of England Temperance Society, viz., the Band of Hope, can speak openly as to all its details and as to the relative advantages of total abstinence and temperance; there is no need of the slightest reticence in the presence of the youngest child. But, as regards much of the work of the Purity Society, the members' lips are sealed, except in secret council or from the pulpit, and always when addressing mixed assemblies of the young of both sexes, and even among those who are no longer young, how careful must we be, how reticent, how reverent, how prayerful. At "Blue Ribbon" meetings attended by boys and girls, each with their bit of ribbon prominently displayed, I have heard clever speeches from some of the leaders of the movement, teeming with witticisms and jokes, and bristling with epigrams; but with our sad subject there is no room even for smiles—for joy, yes! for joy, over one sinner we may aid to repent, but humour and wit are of course utterly out of place, as would be any similar *outward* display of a white cross or purity badge. If a badge be adopted, it should be out of sight, and worn solely for help to the wearer, not to attract attention.

All men who join the Church of England Purity Society, or the Church Penitentiary Association, or the White Cross Army, or the Minors' Protection Society, or any other of this class—I say this advisedly—should for their *own protection* and for the safe promotion of their common object, keep always present before them the intense and momentous gravity of the crusade they have entered on. The Council of the Central Society, while it allows *branches* to have, with proper safeguards, associates (male) under eighteen, does not, and wisely in my opinion, admit any such recruits into its own body. Lads, if allowed any place in the Society, should be under the watchful eye of the wise and prudent head of some *local* branch or of some affiliated society, and, in my opinion, it

* Most strange is it that some good, but very short-sighted men and women have thought that the dangers and difficulties outweighed the possible advantages of establishing a Purity Society—some have even gone so far as to doubt the wisdom of rescue work, saying (I have heard it myself), "Remember that for every woman who is rescued, another will fall to fill her place." I have really, I assure you, heard this argument against rescue work from the mouth of one who had the reputation of being a very wise and religious man. This statement can easily be disproved, although advocated by many, and, even if true, should be valueless in the eyes of any *Christian* as a support to this "let-alone" policy. Another argument for inaction, only consistent it seems to me in the mouth of a Mohammedan, who does not believe that women have souls to be saved, is the assumed necessity of brothels for the health of unmarried men. This also is a fallacy, which has been exposed, and is scouted by the most eminent medical men.

should be a fundamental regulation for the guidance of *Associates* that all conversation on the subject between *Associates* should be, if not absolutely forbidden, yet discouraged to the utmost. It might be a useful rule in these local affiliated societies and branches which have associates, that conversation on the subject should be confined to occasions when a *Member* was present, and the conversation commenced and ended with the Society's prayer.

It has been wisely recommended to persons engaged in Preventive and Curative "Work," either as sisters, chaplains, wardens, or as members of the Council, and even as ordinary members and associates, that they should be careful to divert their minds frequently from this painful, although self-imposed, duty, by having some alternative work of a widely different nature, so as to ward off the morbid effect on the mind, which constant dwelling on so distressing a subject has been found to bring about.

I have kept these remarks for the conclusion of my paper, because I wish them to be impressed on your memories, as no one should join as a *worker* (as distinct from a subscriber) in this cause who is not fully impressed with the solemnity of the undertaking and the increased watchfulness incumbent on him, lest, whilst attempting to save others, he himself, even if not "becoming a castaway," may yet cause some weak brother or sister to offend by over-familiarising them with what is at the same time a repulsive and yet, to some minds, a most absorbing subject. As was well said at Lambeth Palace, how grievous may be the mischief of "neglecting that judicious reticence which it is best should be maintained in conversation regarding infringements of the great Christian law of chastity."

It is hoped that when the Church of England Purity Society is fully at work, its office, No. 111, Palace Chambers, Bridge Street, Westminster, may be regarded as head-quarters for affording information to clergy and others desirous of learning what is being done, and how best they can set to work in their dioceses, parishes, etc., to aid the progress of the great cause.

The Church of England Temperance Society and the Young Men's Friendly Society, branches of which should be established in every parish, will probably ally themselves closely with the Church of England Purity Society; and the White Cross Army will, it is hoped, be *affiliated* to the Church of England Purity Society. By aid of these various agencies, which are rapidly being spread over the country, every man of whatever class or position in life; every lad, after his confirmation, if he be qualified, will, if he joins them, be encouraged to constantly renew his baptismal vows, not only to keep himself *sober* and *temperate*, but also *chaste*, and not merely selfishly to care for himself in these respects, but also help others to do likewise.

The new society exacts no *pledge*, only a declaration that the *member* "accepts the principles of the Church of England Purity Society, and undertakes, according to his ability, to promote its objects." I need hardly say that one of the cardinal principles of the Church of England Purity Society is that purity is "equally obligatory on men and women alike."

His Grace the Archbishop of Canterbury was pleased, at the request

of the Council of the Church of England Purity Society, to compose for us a prayer, which I will read to you shortly, a copy of which is given to all members.

The Prayer, composed by His Grace the Archbishop of Canterbury for the Church of England Purity Society, at the request of the Council :—

O Lord Jesu Christ, Sinless Son of Man, Who art evermore ready to succour them that are tempted, grant unto us Thy servants in this league both valour and constancy, that we may keep undefiled our own purity, fight manfully against the corruption that is in the world, and shield and rescue those that are in peril and sore beset.

Restore the fallen, O Lord, to themselves and Thee ; and in garments white through Thy Blood bring us all unto the home where the pure in heart see God.

These things we ask of the Love of the Father and the Power of the Holy Ghost, in Thy Name Who with Them livest and reignest one God world without end. *Amen.*

LAMBETH PALACE,
July, 1883.

ADDRESSES.

The Rev. CANON SCOTT HOLLAND, Senior Student, Christ Church, Oxford.

AT the risk of greatly wearying you, I have to recall your attention from these most interesting details to the consideration of the first principles enunciated by Dr. Ridding. Why is it that we, who have this cause of purity so much at heart, should have to plead that it requires new and special efforts and methods? Do we mean, when we speak of the pressure and strain on purity, that things are worsening? I should say not so. It is possible to draw a very dark picture of what may be, but language on such a point must be double-sided, and in the present freedom of intercourse between men and women there is evidence of a larger power of control than was formerly known, and, again, there is a larger body of men every year who are ready to act up to high ideals, and to respond to the highest possible demands. Why, then, is there need for any special effort? It is because we find that this assemblage of complicated forces, which we call civilisation, offers itself as readily to the cause of evil as to the cause of good. It is ready with its machinery to enlarge all opportunities, and to expand all possibilities, by combination and specialisation, so that vice has become also a civilised thing. It is no longer a mere blind impulse of passion, but knows how to enrich itself, for instance, with the delicacies of art and how to array on its side the more elastic philosophies. Vice combines and specialises, and it is impossible for virtue to remain any longer like a flower springing up in the old simplicity. Virtue, too, must become civilised : it must combine and specialise in order to meet these complicated difficulties, which are becoming more complex every day, and it must labour in order to contend against the laboriousness that is building up the civilised vice among us. Virtue cannot grow, any more than a flower can grow in the heart of cities, without special encouragement and culture. What has happened to draw our attention so much to this subject? Vice has been changed by the mere fact of its being combined and massed in great cities. In former days it was hidden in this and that corner, and it was possible to pass it by. But it has grown, it is staring us in the face, it is in our streets, the sounds of it are in our ears, and we

cannot help seeing and hearing it. It must be recognised and considered. It is there, whatever we feel, and think, and say. It is daring us and challenging us. It takes to itself the language of political freedom—all those phrases of the conventional unconventionalism of which Dr. Ridding spoke—it knows how to bring into the streets all the jargon of the studio; in revolt against the narrow prudery which fails to distinguish between the pure and impure treatment of the human form, it leaves the security of the studio and becomes freely handled by men and women who but half understand art. It is arguing, it is pleading, it is calling on history to give evidence of its necessity. It has a thousand ways of ensnaring, not the pure, but those who, stumbling along in the path of purity, bring to the encounter a mind blinded by the thought of old sins, and a will all undermined by the memories of old shames. These are they who are ensnared in masses. We want societies such as that for which we are pleading; we want to meet this magnitude of sin with a corresponding magnitude of holiness and purity, by combining, in the form of specialisation, all those elements that make up righteousness in lonely corners here on earth, to give them all a high sense of brotherhood and companionship, and to bring good heart and cheer to those who are dispirited and alarmed. Then we want to meet this reasoning knowledge of vice with a reasoned knowledge of holiness. We must do this. We must remember, as we recall all the perils that may come from frank speech, all those souls who are dying by thousands through silence and ignorance. They must hear what we try to keep from them: if there is one thing that the civilised life does for us, it is to make any one bit of knowledge permeate the whole, and sooner—far sooner than we think—men know. We want, then, to give them a cue for dealing with all the intricacies of art. We know they cannot keep their eyes guarded unless they have some principle which will enable them, by reflection and care, to discover what is pure and what is impure in art. We also say that if men find it dangerous to turn their eyes in upon themselves, and to speculate whether it be true that a man is much damaged by this sinning, if all the lines of rigid purity seem to waver and grow indistinct—let them turn and look at the woman's side of the question. In the lot and disaster of the women there is a terrible woe by which all casuistical scepticism is shattered. Let men have this burnt into their imaginations, and held fast in their reasons, so that they may have the picture always in front of them. We know, if we will but turn our eyes upon what they suffer, that there is no sin in the world against which the judgment of God speaks out so unmistakably. It seems sometimes as if those flames of judgment which are held back by the gates of death, in this case, as in that of drunkenness, leap through the bars, and anticipate the terrible day. It is the people who have fought through the battle of rescue work who are asking us to enter upon another work altogether. They tell us that their work is useless because it deals merely with the supply, and it is hopeless to deal with the supply so long as the demand remains untouched. They want us, then, to do this work—to do the work of men for men, to do something to put a stop to all the degrading talk, to do something for the cause of clean houses and good employment, and to work against the custom, and habit, and legislation which bears on its face the shameful brand of a legislation made by men only for men. Any man who, at the time that legislation was before the House of Lords, cared to look through the daily papers, will understand what I mean when I speak of the selfishness of men, remembering all the glib apologies that were made about men's risks and dangers. You found articles in the daily papers pleading that a man should not be under the hardship of finding himself in the clutch of the law because a woman happened to be over 18 instead of under. They spoke of him as having to be watched and guarded from such a trip, and not a word was said of the risks and

dangers on the other side. We want to hear the women's side. We want to hear those women who have worked hard for women. We are told that they scream. Yes! they scream as wounded creatures scream, because there is no other way of making themselves heard at all; but we believe they would scream less if there were thousands of men banded together into a combination, who would be prepared to hear their cry, and to be sympathetic and gentle with them, looking at the women's side, and placing it side by side with that of the men. Even if we have to qualify some of the utterances of those women, and to control their passion, we want to hear them. We want all the dauntless rigour of their idealism, all the forces of their indignation, and all the unflagging power of their faith to be brought home to us. And then, if only we can have those men ready and combined—apart from women, if you will—if we could have a combination of men who would hear the women, we might have some chance of bringing about that rectification of judgment which society so terribly needs. I have only one word more to say. All who take part in such work, can do so only in the grace and power of the Incarnate Christ which will lay hold of their bodies with such energy and practical force, as to fill them with the faith which can say to mountains, "Be thou removed, and be thou cast into the sea."

The Rev. A. G. Butler, Fellow of Oriel College, Oxford.

It is a grave responsibility to speak on such a subject to men who have grown grey in combating this and like evils in great cities, or our rural districts. My experience is rather of schools and colleges, where the evil begins. But that experience has led me to believe in the necessity of some new means to fight against it, in an age when temptation is so rife. Novels, plays, newspapers of a lower class, even philosophic and quasi-scientific theory, make light of indulgences. A young man finds his earlier and better faith assailed on all sides. The "*quod semper, quod ubique, quod et omnibus*" argument seems arrayed against him. And so it often happens, that not wishing to appear singular, he first tolerates, then imitates, the coarse joke, the obscene allusion, gradually getting a new and lower conscience in the matter, even though his acts are pure; and then he goes away to the life in great cities, and *does* as others do. He hates the loose and bad talk to begin with, but is carried on and on by insensible degrees to the bad act and loose life. Now, against such an evil, as other means of meeting it have failed, I believe we shall do well to try the principle of association. Evil influences are strong, aggressive, associated; meet them with a force strong and united as their own. Many will stand the firmer from the mere knowledge that there is an effort being made to stem the evil; a great reality at work, as real as the evil forces they see and hear around them. And this work is worthy of the Church of England and its appointed leaders. It alone could carry on the work generally, wisely, and with success. It was, therefore, with great delight that we, who thus think, read the opening speech of the Archbishop of Canterbury, in which he placed among the foremost objects to be contended for, the Purity of the People. It is the note of a true Church to be not slack in vital questions, but to place itself in the front in warring against the great evils of society. And men, weary of controversy, will gladly recognise such a leader. They are longing for something more definite than a casual allusion or a special sermon against the evil of impurity. And association, the common habit of Englishmen in other things, seems in place here. Wherever men are in earnest, they associate. In

games, in politics, for Church objects, they invariably associate. They thus combine the knowledge, and carry on the effort needed for success. They are much stronger, heartier, more hopeful when linked with others. And if any of those here present will make the trial, as we have made it in Oxford, of associating for this special object of promoting Purity, they will find, I think, at least in great towns, how immediate is the answer to the appeal. Earnest men will at once come forward to join them; even with those who decline to join them, as objecting to all associations, especially on such a subject, their very presence in the midst of society will have an influence. There will be the eternal protest against wrong-doing, and the witness to a higher life. Fine manly fellows, who say they do not want such a thing, they do not like it, may be moved thereby to think how terribly near the temptation is. It would be pleasant, of course, to leave such a subject, odious and repulsive as it is, quite alone, to pigeon-hole it away, and fence it off from the light of day. But you cannot do it; the evil is too general and pervading; and to those who look to its final issues, it will seem a vital matter to war against it, developed as it is by modern civilisation and life in great cities—for England must be pure, if she is to be strong.

The Rev. V. H. Stanton, Fellow and Senior Dean of Trinity College, Cambridge.

Coming at this time before the meeting, after so many earnest and able addresses and papers, in which there has been so much with which one necessarily agrees, it is impossible that I should do more than emphasise and enlarge a little upon some of those points which seem most important. One thing I would desire to impress upon the meeting is, that the only really effectual remedy we can bring against this vice is a change of heart, producing an influence upon public opinion, by working upon individuals, and then in time, through the union of individuals in society, reacting upon other individuals. I do not for a moment lose sight of the importance of those measures which have been brought before us under the head of "The Prevention of the Degradation of Women and Children." It is undoubtedly our duty to make vice as difficult as possible; and knowing the weakness of our own wills, and of the wills of so many young men, we cannot overlook the fact, that the difficulty of committing a sin is one of the most important safe-guards we can have. But we have been again and again shown how it is that this vice if repressed in one form, hides itself under some other form. It is only by a radical change of feeling in society that we can effectually and permanently diminish it. One great means by which we must hope to effect this is by appealing to men. Can we not, all of us here, who have in any way the care of souls, resolve that we will before very long speak on this subject to the men who are submitted to our care. It may not be advisable—I do not think it is—to speak in mixed congregations; but I can see no possible harm for any man who has any common sense at all in handling this subject, to speak to congregations of men. It is possible to speak of it with the most perfect solemnity, and to avoid all details which may in any way incite to thoughts of sin. Shall we not also all resolve that we will soon gather together our male communicants, and encourage them to stand out distinctly amongst those with whom they live, and to let their feelings be known in their workshops and places of business, when sinful words, or wrong judgments are uttered. And again, let us call together all the men we can well do to our churches or school-rooms to hear earnest addresses on the subject. Here I would remind the meeting of what was

said by Dr. Ridding. The voice of the layman has a special effect on this subject. Let us try to get laymen to do this work, taking care to carefully choose the right men for it. Let also those laymen who are here endeavour to inform themselves on the subject, and endeavour by careful thought to speak firmly and forcibly to others. There is one motive to which we may appeal with a special hope of influencing. It is one of the happiest and most hopeful signs in the modern feeling on this subject, that emphasis is being laid on the cruelty of sins of impurity, and on appeals to chivalry among men. We can never, indeed, cease to speak of the great primary religious motives, that man was made in the image of God ; that Christ became incarnate, and that we are temples of the Holy Ghost ; but we shall appeal to them often rather in order to teach men to believe in these truths than to use them as leverage for morality. How can they be leverage for morality with those men who—as we know is the case with so many—have not living faith in them at all. But it is rare, indeed, to find any man who is so much hardened in the courses of vice that he is not able to see the cruelty of this sin. I am sure there is no kind of appeal which can be used with more effect ; I have seen how young men at Cambridge respond to it. There is also another way in which we may hope to educate society into a proper feeling on this subject, and that is by the consideration of those social problems which are connected with this vice. From our present point of view, the chief value of the consideration of all such social problems will be its educational effect in the minds of men. We may do something by means of various measures, whether legislative or voluntary, but if in any way such measures diminish the sense among men of the heinousness of this sin, any other effect can count as nothing in comparison. We shall be tempted to treat this vice as necessary, to come to terms with it, practically, if not in words, to deal with consequences instead of going to the root of the evil. In all such ways we shall be but aggravating the mischief. There is one such social problem mentioned by Admiral Ryder, which, according to the rules laid down for this meeting, we are forbidden to speak upon. I have no intention of seeking to evade that rule. Yet let me say, that it is surely the duty of all thoughtful men carefully to study that subject, and not lightly to take up the current popular views to be found in newspapers, and among men of the world. Grave charges are brought against the acts I refer to, by men of high position and character, and earnest moral life, men who have deeply pondered constitutional and social problems, and it is our duty to weigh carefully their reasons. There is one other point on which I wish to say a few words, namely, that of the influence of women in connection with this question. I need not, after the eloquent words of Canon Scott Holland, speak of the importance of listening to the voice of woman ; but it does seem necessary to add, that there is great danger that we in the Church of England should not sufficiently realise the existence of this new force which is being brought to bear on the question. I do not for a moment doubt that the committee were wise in calling this meeting for men only ; nor do I question the wisdom of all those limitations which have been enumerated by Dr. Ridding. Let us, as far as possible, avoid offences against taste. But is it not possible to use the great power which woman exercises amongst us? We, in the Church of England, are apt to be a quarter of a century behind with regard to social movements. The upper classes of society have such a preponderant voice in the Church, that good taste and conventionalism commonly receive more than their due. Undoubtedly the larger interest which is taken in this question of Social Purity, and the truer view of the cruelty done to women, has coincided with the time since women have made their voices heard, and have taken a greater share in public life. Whether we like it or not, it is our duty to use this force for the Church, and to bring it into the regular

system of Church organisation. My Lord Archbishop, and my Lord Bishops, our sisters have a right to your encouragement and sanction in the work in which they are engaged. It is undoubtedly only exceptional women who can fitly speak to men, at least in large meetings, on this subject; but I can add my testimony to that of Dr. Ridding, that in some cases this has been done with excellent effect, and without the slightest offence against taste and purity. Unquestionably, some of those men who feel most keenly on this subject, and who are now labouring to stir up their brother men, have received their chief information from women. But we have also need of a whole army of women being called into existence to work upon women; to sympathise, not only with their fallen, but with their tempted sisters; to do what they can, by their sympathy and their friendliness, to save young girls placed in positions of temptation. Miss Hopkins, it is well known, is engaged in calling women all over England to this excellent work; and most of us are doubtless acquainted with that excellent little book of hers, "Grave Moral Questions." But there are surely hundreds and thousands of women who would respond to any sanction and encouragement given by their pastors, especially the chief pastors of the Church, but who without it will hold back. It is our duty as a Church to give them that sanction and encouragement. This work of livening public opinion is indeed so vast and so appalling in many of its forms, that we are often inclined to be disheartened; but yet to doubt that the Church can do this work would be to betray our faith. It has been called to be the salt of society, and in what particular should it salt and prevent the corruption of society more than in this? From the very first, this was one of the chief battles of the Church. We hear the exhortations of the Apostles, telling their converts that one great difference between them and their neighbours was that they had been delivered from these lusts of the flesh; and in the next century, we know how the Apologists pointed to the power of Christian faith to produce purity in men and women, as being that which would most impress their heathen neighbours. It is true that at a later time the Church seemed by herself unequal to the struggle against impurity, and that she received the assistance of the new races which invaded the Roman Empire. But perhaps sufficient weight is not usually given to the fact that it was the Christianisation of the German races which enabled them to preserve their primitive virtues in the midst of the corrupt Roman society. Once more we are called to a new effort in this great cause, and we go forth to the battle with all the faith of our fathers in our breasts.

The Right Hon. Lord Brabazon.

The subject of the prevention of the degradation of women and children is a most appropriate one to have been brought forward for discussion at the Church Congress of 1883, as this year has witnessed the inauguration, at Lambeth Palace, of a Church of England Purity Society, under the Presidency of His Grace the Archbishop of Canterbury. It was time that some such step should be taken by the National Church. It was time that the Church should cease to ignore, as she practically has done in the past, the existence of this cancer in her midst. The Church has not hesitated to grapple—and that successfully—with intemperance; she has now determined, God helping her, to stamp out the twin evil, impurity. In the words of the archbishop, the people of this country have declared, with no uncertain voice, that they will no longer be a drunken people, it is now for

them to say that they will no longer be an unclean people. My time is limited, and I shall not waste it by producing proof of that which must be patent to all—viz., that large numbers of women and children in this country are living lives of the most degraded character. The recent Report of the Committee of the House of Lords appointed to investigate into this painful subject is sufficient proof, if proof were wanted, of the extent of this evil. Let those who doubt it read the report for themselves; let them peruse some of Miss Ellice Hopkins' publications; and if after their perusal they can quietly sit down at their firesides and say that there is no need for action, they must be possessed of much harder hearts than I should like to credit any friend of mine with the possession of. I will, therefore, take it for granted that we are all agreed that there exists a terrible evil in our midst, and that our object to-day is to find out the best means of correcting and eradicating it if possible, and of encouraging one another in the prosecution of steps towards this desirable end. Although the Church of England has not as a corporate body previously to this year taken any active steps in the matter, the field of labour has not been entirely unoccupied, thanks to that noble-minded woman, Miss Ellice Hopkins, the Social Purity Alliance, and the White Cross Army, and we must not omit to add thanks to the preventive work of Mrs. Townsend and her noble band of over 100,000 ladies and working girl members of the Girls' Friendly Society, pledged to promote the cause of purity within the homes of England. The Report of the Committee of the House of Lords has shown that prostitution is not confined to adults, but that children of 13 and 14 years of age are being sacrificed to the passions of wicked men. The disclosures which have been made by the report of the committee, have sent a thrill of horror through the heart of the nation, and it is to be hoped that public opinion, once aroused to the crimes which are being perpetrated in our midst, will not rest until steps have been taken by the municipal authorities of all large towns to combat this evil in the effectual and practical manner adopted in Glasgow and Edinburgh, and more recently in Manchester and Leeds. The system of repression of vice carried out in Glasgow is a combination of just law, municipal vigilance, and private beneficence. By an Act passed in 1843, and amended in '62 and '63, if a citizen state to a magistrate that he knows certain premises to be used as a brothel (whether they are conducted quietly or not is immaterial), and if a superintendent of police can corroborate that statement, the magistrate is required to issue a warrant extending for thirty days; and if the police at any time during those thirty days find men or women staying in the house for purposes of prostitution, they can take into custody the person in charge of the house, the proprietress of the brothel, or anyone she may have managing it for her. The magistrates may then inflict a fine or imprisonment, and on the occasion of a second offence may close the house; but this has never yet been found necessary, as the people wind up the business themselves. From the above statement it will be noticed (and this is an important point to bear in mind), that the motive power in putting down prostitution must always be the citizen, and to effect this a "Repressive Committee" of citizens has been formed at Glasgow. By another section of this Act, public solicitation to prostitution, whether by men or women, is made illegal; and every prostitute or street-walker loitering in any road, street, court, or common stair, or importuning passengers for the purpose of prostitution, is liable to a fine of ten shillings, or to fourteen days' imprisonment. Since 1870, these powers have been vigorously and successfully put in force in Glasgow, with the following results :—

1. The streets have been cleared of the disreputable business of solicitation and assignation.

2. The number of brothels has been steadily and largely decreased, notwithstanding the growth of population.
3. Clandestine prostitution has decreased generally in the same ratio as the brothels.
4. There has been a slight decrease in illegitimacy.
5. An increased desire to reform has been shown by fallen women.
6. Crime, always connected with vice, has diminished.
7. Disease, which arises from promiscuous intercourse, has decreased.

I am indebted for the above facts to a little leaflet, entitled, "The Glasgow System for the Repression of Vice," published by Messrs. Hatchard. In disproof of the popular but mischievous error that vigorous repression of the public manifestation of vice is necessarily productive of an increase of secret vice, the Chief of the Police in Glasgow declares that "it is a matter of fact, not mere conjecture, that the administration has reduced the number of prostitutes not residing in brothels;" and again, that "notwithstanding the frequently expressed opinion of well-meaning people, who take, as they state, a philosophical view of prostitution and brothel-keeping, and from their mode of reasoning arrive at the conclusion that both are necessary evils, and incapable of being either eradicated or greatly diminished, I consider myself justified in the opinion that the results indicated above, and which have been brought about by a steady and persistent application of the law by the authorities, have been of very great advantage to this community. Viewed from no higher standpoint than that of profit and loss in property, the benefits are apparent and tangible; but when the social and moral advantages are taken into account—the removal of seductive temptations from the youthful and thoughtless, and not infrequently from the intoxicated and foolish adult—the results, though they cannot be expressed in figures, are far more precious. While the reduction in the number of brothels has been so considerable, and the streets have been to a great extent cleared of abandoned women, who used to frequent them, I am at the present time without one single complaint from a respectable citizen that prostitution has gone into more secret or private channels, or that the repressive measures of the authorities have inflicted the slightest hardship upon anyone." The above evidence, given before the Select Committee of the House of Commons on the Contagious Diseases Acts, in July, 1881, by the Head of the Glasgow Police, is worthy of most serious consideration, coming as it does from a man who has had the best opportunities of studying the action of the repressive measures adopted by the Glasgow authorities. There is, alas! a vast amount of impurity to be found in our country villages; but impurity is more especially the vice of large cities and of rich luxurious communities; and, inasmuch as England is wealthy, and we are rapidly becoming a nation of dwellers in cities, it is not to be wondered at, though it is greatly to be deplored, that this vice has assumed such terrible proportions as to require on the part of the National Church a special organisation to combat its advances. All the conditions favourable to the growth of this vice are to be found in our large towns, and especially in the metropolis, where, perhaps, least has been done to counteract it. Young men and women, emancipated from home ties and restraints, come up annually to London and to our large towns by thousands and tens of thousands to seek their living. It is calculated that there are over 100,000 shop assistants (the vast majority of whom are young) living in the metropolis alone, and this is only the number of one special class. Working all day in innumerable counting-houses, workshops, and factories, young men and women are turned out at night into the gas-lit streets to seek their pleasure. And what are the pleasures which are provided for the young in large towns? Gin palaces, drinking saloons, dancing halls, low-class theatres. In all

these low places of amusement visitors are expected to drink. It is by the sale of intoxicating liquor that a profit is made. Crowded promiscuously together—young men and women sitting literally sometimes on each other's knees, excited by drink—is it wonderful if passions, which are not much restrained, should break forth to the ruin of thousands? Example is all powerful. Some recreation must be obtained. That which at first shocked ceases to shock, and is shortly enjoyed. The young man or woman who has been well brought up at home, soon finds that he or she is considered straitlaced and pharisaical in objecting to do what all around them do. The moral standard becomes lowered; the edge of modesty by degrees is blunted; the outworks of virtue are sapped; and the final fall becomes often, alas! only a matter of time. Is this sad result to be wondered at? I think not. City life offers few, if any, restraining influences to the indulgence by the young of their sensual passions. The religious and the moral sentiment of the mass of city dwellers are not strongly developed. It is not possible for the most active minister of religion to bring his ministrations to the door of the thousands who form his flock, or to get to know the members of it individually. Moreover, this army of young men and women see that their social superiors are not above reproach. The society journals, which are largely read by the young, lose no opportunity of blazoning forth the evil deeds of fashionable *roués* of both sexes. Each class has its own code of morals, some more and some less severe, in the case of the infraction of the Law of Chastity, but all seem to acquiesce in this injustice—that there should be one law for women in this matter and another for men. The Church of England Purity Society protests against this injustice, and protests also against the assertion that man cannot attain to full physical development without giving the rein to unlawful passions. As long as the present false standard of virtue is maintained, and men who are living in open sin are received with open arms by society, because they are wealthy or influential, it is hopeless to expect any great regeneration in the nation at large. When the upper and middle classes have cleansed themselves from the foul leprosy which so largely infects them; when the conscience of so-called society has been awakened to the injustice of its conduct towards sinners of opposite sexes; and when the sin of unchastity is punished with equal severity, whether committed by the man or by the woman, other classes will not be slow to follow the example thus set.

> "Why go to Newgate? Why
> Preach to poor rogues? and wherefore not begin
> With Carlton, or with other Houses? Try
> Your hand at hardened and imperial sin.
> To mend the people's an absurdity,
> A jargon, a mere philanthropic din,
> Unless you make your betters better."

If we really intend to take practical action to put a stop to the present awful extent to which the degradation of women and children is being carried on, we should then, in my opinion, turn our first efforts towards a reform in the standard of public opinion amongst the upper and middle classes with regard to the heinousness of the crime of unchastity in both sexes. To effect this, we should 1st.—Labour at the formation of branches of the Church of England Purity Society in our colleges and public schools. Frequent lectures to young men alone should be given on this subject, and the clergy should be urged to address special sermons to male audiences on the sin of impurity. 2ndly.—Our next effort should be to obtain authoritative statements from the best medical men regarding the fallacy of the argument that the physical health of men is endangered or lowered by abstinence from unlawful indulgence. 3rdly.—We should encourage in every parish in the kingdom the formation of associations respectively of young men and women of all classes, with

a view to the promotion of purity and temperance, such as the Young Men's and Girls' Friendly Societies, and similar institutions, which lend a helping hand to young men and women on their entrance into life, and which bring them into contact with the Church, and with influences calculated to assist them in their efforts to lead pure and Christian lives. 4thly.—We should form Vigilance Committees in all large town parishes, to see that the law is carried out in regard to the suppression of brothels and street-walkers—to obtain the passing of local acts for facilitating action in the above matters—to agitate for the raising of the age to which, by the existing law, a girl's consent to her seduction is assumed—and to make it penal to harbour girls under 21 for purposes of prostitution, and to increase the penalties for indecent assault. These Vigilance Committees should also see to the enforcement by the magistrates of the Industrial Schools Act Amendment Act, in the case of *all* children living in disorderly houses, or frequenting the company of abandoned women, and that the children are sent to *special* certified Industrial Schools. They might also, in various ways, assist in the suppression of indecent prints, photographs, and advertisements, and in the enforcing of decency in the streets. 5thly.—Every effort should be made to encourage municipalities to put in force the Artisans Dwellings Act, and to extend the operations of the companies engaged in the erection of working men's model dwellings; for until our working classes are decently housed, it is useless to expect them to bring up their sons and daughters in modesty and chastity. 6thly.—We should seriously turn our attention towards the lack of innocent amusements and recreation in our large cities. If we do not approve of the kind of recreation which is offered to the young men and women of our towns—if we do not think that the gin palaces and music hall performances are calculated to elevate and purify the tastes of the people, we ought surely to take some steps to supply them with something better; we might give them playgrounds and gardens, parks and gymnasia, baths and libraries, club-rooms and cheap concerts, readings and dramatic representations. These things are already being done in a small way in the metropolis and elsewhere by societies such as the Kyrle, the Metropolitan Public Garden, Boulevard, and Playground Association, the Park Band, the People's Entertainment, the Popular Ballad, and other societies; whilst lodges and recreation rooms have been established by the Young Men and Women's Christian Associations, the Girls' and Young Men's Friendly and the Young Women's Help Societies; but the public, I fear, are not yet sufficiently alive to the urgent necessity which exists for providing the people of our large towns with opportunities of cheap, innocent recreation and amusement. The public do not as yet perceive the close connection which exists between wretched habitations and crime, between the want of innocent recreation and immorality. And yet these bear very closely one on the other. It is sincerely to be hoped that, before it is too late, the providing of parks, playgrounds, public bands, baths, gymnasia, and libraries will not be left to individuals or to voluntary associations, but will be everywhere regarded as part of the legitimate duties of corporations and municipal bodies. When a healthier public spirit has been aroused amongst all classes, and it is regarded as disgraceful to a man as to a woman to live a life of immorality; when the vigilance of citizens has rendered the calling of the prostitute and of the brothel-keeper precarious and unremunerative; when the nation shall have become temperate in the use of alcoholic drinks; it will appear extraordinary that so fearful a state of things as that disclosed by the Committee of the House of Lords could have existed in the year 1880, and that the National Church should have permitted its existence for so long without taking systematic action to put a stop to the iniquity. Thank God, the Church of England has at length put her hand to the work: she is hard to move, but once aroused, her influence is far-reaching and her

power vast. With the organisation and the resources at her command, there is every reason to believe that, under Divine blessing, success will ultimately attend her efforts to cleanse the land from foul impurities, and to teach her people to reverence their bodies as made after the Divine Image, and as the temples of the Holy Ghost.

> " So dear to Heaven is saintly Chastity
> That when a soul is found sincerely so,
> A thousand liveried angels lackey her,
> Driving far off each thing of sin and guilt,
> And in clear dream and solemn vision,
> Tell her of things that no gross ear can hear ;
> Till oft converse with heavenly habitants,
> Begin to cast a beam on the outward shape,
> The unpolluted Temple of the mind,
> And turns it by degrees to the soul's essence,
> Till all be made immortal ; but when Lust
> By unchaste looks, loose gestures, and foul talk,
> But most by lewd and lavish act of sin,
> Lets in defilement to the inward parts,
> The soul grows clotted by contagion,
> Imbodies and imbrutes, till she quite lose
> The divine property of her first being."

W. H. Heaton, Esq. *

A great deal of enthusiasm has been shown by this meeting, and the hearers have evidently been in sympathy with the speakers. I wish they would strike while the iron is hot. The secretaries of the Church of England Purity Society will be waiting in the reception room after the meeting to enroll the names of those who wish to become members. I would ask all here present not to be a quarter of a century behind the age in this matter, but to take it up at once, and to show that the Church of England really means to bring this work to a successful issue. Canon Butler says that the degradation of women is always due to the selfish brutality of men. I intend to take the other side on that question. I know it is an unpopular side, but still truth is truth, and before everything we must have truth. I feel certain it is a mistake to say that every fallen woman is an injured innocent, and has been degraded by some selfish and mean sensualist. I believe that in many cases the woman meets the man half-way, and in some cases the woman actually tempts the man first. There are thousands of fallen women who never were anything else since the time when they were ten or eleven years old, and ran wild in the gutter, consorting with boys of equally wild natures. I know that there are girls who have been brought up to the profession of prostitution, have been sold for high prices, have saved and invested their money, and have looked forward to a life of ease on their retirement from what they consider as honourable a profession as many others. All these are facts. I am not telling you what I have imagined, but what I have proved, by personal investigation, to be true. I served for 18 years in a man-of-war, and for nine of those years in the midshipman's berth of a small craft. Many besides naval men will understand what that means. I have also made it my business, of late, to go thoroughly into the details of this matter, and I know what I am speaking about. At the risk of making myself unpopular, or even of checking, so to speak, a move of popular enthusiasm, I

* Mr. Heaton was suddenly called upon to compress his prepared speech so as not to occupy more than five minutes, instead of fifteen, as previously arranged.

am obliged to say this. But I hold that this is no reason why men should not help forward this work. They should do so because women are women, because their wills and their minds are in many cases not so strong as men's, because man is the head of the woman, and woman should be the glory of the man. Men are bound to come forward to the aid of women, and to save them, so to speak, from themselves. This is Christ's own work, and therefore men are bound to give themselves up to the salvation of women. I hope that every man here will think it his duty to take up this cause, and that every man will actively interest himself in it, not being content with merely saying, "hear, hear," and being pleased with the sentiments which have been expressed here to-day, but resolving to do something for the cause, to endeavour to interest other people in it, and to make it a point that those others shall carry the work still further on among their friends. I have been told that it is impossible to work against the instinct and feelings of men. Impossible! What can be impossible when it is God's work? Before Lazarus was raised from his grave, did not his loving sister, Mary, think that would be impossible? When the apostles were first told that their Lord had risen from the dead, was not their first cry, "Impossible?" As that Lord of theirs and ours did rise from the tomb on the first Easter morning, so will we raise our fallen sisters and brethren from the slough of sensuality into which they have fallen, and so transform society that in the light of a purer generation the story of the degradation of women and children will seem like the half-forgotten, half-fabulous echo of a thing that never existed.

CONGRESS HALL,

WEDNESDAY AFTERNOON, OCTOBER 3RD.

The Right Rev. the PRESIDENT in the Chair.

THE MARRIAGE LAWS.

The Right Rev. the PRESIDENT.

BEFORE we begin our discussion, I think I may perhaps properly mention that His Grace the Archbishop allowed me to send an appropriate greeting, in his name and my own, as President of the Congress, to the American Church assembled in its Convention this day, as having offered prayer for them here in Congress this morning. I cannot call upon the first speaker without just thanking him for having thrown himself into the breach which was made by the illness of the Archdeacon of Oxford, who had accepted a place in this discussion.

PAPERS.

The Ven. JAMES LESLIE RANDALL, Archdeacon of Buckingham.

Is the law of marriage of Divine authority, based on the revealed Word of God, or is it of purely civil regulation, subject to the fluctuations of human legislation, which are to be fitted to the demands of society

from time to time? Upon the answer to this question will practically depend the course which the marriage laws of this and of all other countries will follow, and therewith the purity of family life. I am entitled to assume in this Congress that there will be no dispute as to the Divine institution of marriage, as to a Divine law regulating that institution revealed to man, as to a permanent status into which the marriage contract is an introduction, and, particularly, as to the assertion that the Divine law of marriage regulates the question of divorce, that for Christian men our Lord's words dealing with that question are decisive. Of course there are differences of opinion as to the exact meaning of our Lord's words; whether, *i.e.*, they absolutely exclude the re-marriage of divorced persons in any case, whether they allow the re-marriage of the innocent party in the one excepted case where separation seems to some to be permitted, or whether the re-marriage of both parties is lawful, and even inter-marriage between the guilty spouse and the partner in guilt. I cannot refrain from expressing my own strong conviction that no re-marriage in the lifetime of the partner is lawful; that therefore all such re-marriage is adulterous; that to put away wife or husband is to err against what St. Augustine (*de cong. adult.* 1 cap. vii.) calls the "*miseri cordissimum Domini preceptum*," which, as he says, would protect the guilty from the snare of a new connection, necessarily adulterous, and would leave the door open for repentance and reconciliation. But whether this view be correct or not, there will be found very few who will deny that our Lord's words prohibit the re-marriage of the guilty person. The Bishop of Lincoln sums up the results of an examination of the passages of Holy Scripture concerning divorce, and of ancient authorities, thus:—1. That a man may not divorce his wife except for fornication. (I may remind you that in Dr. Döllinger's opinion this refers to the case, and that only, of undiscovered ante-nuptial impurity.) 2. That if a man divorces his wife for *this* cause, it is not *expedient* for him to marry again in the life-time of the partner whom he has divorced. Some Latin fathers say it is not *lawful.* 3. That whosoever marrieth a woman that has been divorced committeth adultery. (Com. on St. Matt. xix. 9.) With this position, I am quite content so far as my argument is concerned. It would indeed be quite sufficient for me to state, what no one will contradict, because the necessity of procuring an Act of Parliament in each case proved it, that till very recently the common law of England, as well as the ecclesiastical law, did not allow married persons to be divorced, but treated the marriage bond as indissoluble: though a separation, "*à mensâ et thoro*," was granted for certain causes by the ecclesiastical courts. Thus Lord Hatherley: "Before the Divorce Act of 1857 the law of England would not recognise the possibility of the annihilation of a marriage, or of any dissolution of a marriage; for whenever such expressions as "*divorce à vinculo*" occur, they always refer to cases . . . . . where there never had existed a *vinculum*, and the so-called marriage was never a marriage at all." (Wilkinson *v.* Gibson, 1867). And Lord Lyndhurst, in a debate in the House of Lords, May 20, 1856: "The ecclesiastical courts have no power of divorce for adultery. In this country marriage cannot be dissolved on account of adultery by any other machinery except an Act of Parliament." And Lord Cranworth, in the same debate: "A divorce, properly so

called, such as would enable the parties to marry again, was entirely unknown to the law of England." In 1857, the statute (20 and 21 Vic., cap. 85) conferred for the first time upon a court of justice a jurisdiction to grant divorces *à vinculo matrimonii.* Thus the State changed its marriage law. But the Church's law remained the same as before. It could not admit of a corresponding change; because it asserts that marriage is of Divine institution and regulation, that the law of the Church in respect of marriage follows the law of Christ, and that, therefore, to adjust the law of marriage to conformity with the new State marriage law would be to decline from the law of Christ. Observe, I am not now concerned to maintain that the law of the Church was in every respect confirmed by the law of God. I believe that it was so; but that is not material to what I am going to say. The fact remains that the State in 1857 altered its marriage law; that the Church did not alter her marriage law, but maintained it; that therefore, in 1857, the State parted company with the Church; and that thenceforward the marriage law of the Church was one, the marriage law of the State another. What was the duty of the Church under the circumstances? Clearly, I should say, to provide at once some disciplinary regulations which should, first of all, make it clear to all men that the legislation of the State had not affected the loyalty of the Church to the higher law of God; and next should warn the children of the Church that, her marriage law being of Divine regulation, the legislation of the State could not confer upon them a license to disobey that law. As a matter of fact, the Church took no such action; at all events, I can find no record thereof in the *Journals of Convocation;* though there was no lack of protests against the legislation; there were petitions also from the lower House of the Convocation of Canterbury to the upper House, that their lordships would endeavour in their capacity as members of the House of Lords to obtain amendments of the Act of 1857; and further, among new canons proposed for the consideration of Convocation in 1879, one touching this question finds a place (Canon lxx. "Of second marriages, and when prohibited. Whereas this Church hath ever held that the bond of holy matrimony cannot be dissolved by any authority of man, teaching that 'those whom God hath joined together no man may put asunder,' we do solemnly admonish all members of this Church who are married that they do not contract another marriage, unless the former marriage hath been dissolved by death; and we do also admonish all ministers that they do not solemnise such second marriages without sufficient proof that the former marriage hath been so dissolved"), but this canon has never yet been considered, still less adopted. It would be ungrateful, also, not to record that there were eloquent protests against the Bill of 1857 in both Houses of Parliament by distinguished churchmen, but the very echoes of these have died away, and the new generation has hardly heard of them. Probably most of us are acquainted with cases where divorced persons have sought, and I am afraid we must admit have received, the blessing of the Church upon their so-called re-marriage, and have been admitted to communion. What wonder then, when, to use the words of Milton, "Sin is muffled in the robe of the law, or the law is disguised in the loose garments of sin," that the minds of men are much confused as to the right and the wrong in this all-important matter; that the belief in a Divine unchangeable

law of marriage has grown very indistinct, with the natural consequence that questions relating to the marriage law are debated simply upon the grounds of social expediency, even by persons who in other matters look to the law of God for their guide.

It is with this condition of things that we have to deal; and most of us, in discussing the deceased wife's sister question, have found ourselves placed at a great disadvantage by it. Is it too late to remedy the evil? I hope not. It seems to me that there are two points to which the Church should address herself. 1. The amendment of the statute where that appears to be faulty. As to this first point, I should maintain, even were I addressing an assemblage of non-Christians, that it would still be their duty as good citizens to use all endeavours to induce the legislature to retrace its steps, according to the conclusion of one who certainly could speak with authority on this question. Sir Cresswell Cresswell, who had considered the opposition to the Divorce Bill unreasonable while it was being forced through Parliament, afterwards confessed to the Right Honourable Joseph Napier, "That the opposition was well-grounded, that he had been taught the lesson of experience, that he had come to the conclusion that it was better for society to treat marriage as indissoluble, considering it merely as a social question." (Quoted by Canon Selwyn, in Convocation, May 2, 1866.) But certainly I may urge upon this Congress the necessity of an amendment of the statute; and if I am told that it is vain to hope for such amendment, I reply that the experience of other nations gives no excuse for such cowardly arguments. France retraced her steps after the madness of the first revolution. Prussia has at various times repented of the laxity of her code, and in some respects amended it, and abridged the causes of divorce. Several of the American States have done the same, and a further movement is in progress. Why is England alone to refuse to consider her ways?

2. But I am concerned more with the second point, which is the clear statement by the Church of her own teaching upon the question of divorce. Now as to this. If the law of marriage, as we believe we have it from God, is to be recovered where it has been depraved, and maintained where as yet it is intact, that must be by a revival of the belief that the marriage law is matter of Divine appointment, and this revival of belief must be engendered by some direct act of the Church in the direction of disciplinary regulation. Unless this can be accomplished, the Church must be prepared for wider relaxations in the marriage law of the State, which will be gradual, but will also certainly be rapid. Let it once be conceded or assumed that marriage is merely a civil contract, let the restraints of religion be at once set aside, and the existing marriage law will be protected only by considerations of social and political expediency. Will these long avail? With the history of the agitation in favour of the Bill to legalise the marriage of a man with his deceased wife's sister before our eyes; with all its unscrupulous machinery, and its readiness to evoke in its favour all the devices of partisan politics, we should be foolish indeed if we could not estimate the worthlessness of such safeguards. The selfishness and the passions of men will always provide pleas for the removal of the obstacles which stand in the way of their desires; and there would be always present in their favour that "dangerous force of the plea from consistency, which

tells so strongly on the English mind," and was, in effect, the chief argument which prevailed to carry the Divorce Act. Dr. Nathan Allen, who is an authority upon the subject of the working of divorce laws in America, gives a very salutary warning upon this point. "All persons," he says (*North American Review*, June, 1880, p. 557), "who have any experience in such matters, and know the peculiar arts or means employed to influence legislators, understand at once how easy it is to effect a change in the laws, especially on subjects where the particular points and the effects of such changes are not understood or well considered." It adds greatly to the urgency of this danger that the relaxation of one part of the Divine law of marriage commonly developes laxity in other particulars of that law. It is a fact, and the fact deserves special attention from all at this crisis, that it is precisely in those countries where the restrictions upon marriages between persons related within the forbidden degrees have been relaxed, that the greatest license in respect of divorce prevails. Thus Berlin has an evil pre-eminence among all cities for the number of divorces. The statistics of this subject are saddenning, but it is high time that English men and women should know whither they may be allowing themselves to drift. Dr. Nathan Allen gives the following particulars as to divorces in four of the New England States. In Massachusetts there is one divorce to every fifteen marriages; in Rhode Island, one to every nine; in Vermont, one to every thirteen; in Connecticut, one to every eight (*North American Review*, p. 551, note); in one county of this state, Tolland, it rises to one in every six. (*Woolsey*, p. 230.) "The changes in the law," says Dr. Allen (p. 557), "which have resulted in so many divorces, have all been made within thirty or forty years, and most of them within half that time. They have been made at different times in each state, thus supplying new causes or conditions whereby divorces could be more easily obtained." Mr. Woolsey, another great American authority, says: "If there is any principle in our legislation, it is not a moral one of reverence for the most sacred institution of the family and of married life, but it is a desire to afford relief for cases that are nearly as pressing as those that have relief accorded already." (*Divorce and Divorce Legislation*, p. 247.) The consequence of this is seen in an increasing number of divorces. Dr. Allen (p. 560) says: "What a strange spectacle does it present in social life that within twenty years more than 20,000 divorces should have been granted in four New England States; that in this period the marital relations should be severed between 40,000 persons! In 1860, the number of divorces in these same States did not average 700, but now it averages every year almost twice that number." The rapid increase in the number is noted also by Mr. Woolsey, who says (p. 240) in Vermont the ratio of divorce to marriage for seven years from 1860 to 1866 is 1 to 21.5; for seven years from 1872 to 1878 it is 1 to 15.6 And this is not an exceptional case. In New Hampshire things are worse even than in Connecticut. "It is evident that an immoral habit is here growing rapidly as in Massachusetts"; and, at its present rate of increase, soon Maine "may have the unenviable distinction of going beyond all the other New England States in its looseness in this particular" (pp. 241-2). This makes still more shocking Dr. Allen's further statement that "the

records of the courts in some of the States show that full one quarter of the persons applying for divorce fail for various reasons" (p. 550). Further, and this is a most significant and ominous sentence, Dr. Allen says: "It also appears that the birth-rate and the marriage-rate of the strictly American (population) have for a long time been decreasing, so much so that the increase of numbers in this class is very small, and in some places even doubtful"(p. 561). And in this connection another most significant statement is made by Mr. Wright, Chief of the Bureau of Statistics of Labour, in his Report for 1880, quoted by Mr. Woolsey (p. 236). "The increase of divorces is accompanied in Massachusetts by an increase in the number of leading crimes against chastity and infant life." Mr. Wright's report for 1880 contains the following table of such crimes :—

	1860—1864.		1875—1879.
Adultery	135	....	367
Abortion	3	.....	18
Polygamy	18	.....	50
Fornication	243	.....	934
Rape	16	.....	28
Indecent Exposure	31	.....	118

He adds, indeed, that possibly more careful police supervision may have influenced these statistics, but in any case they are sufficiently disquieting.

This is a terrible depth of moral decline; but it must not be supposed that the extreme limit of laxity has been reached even in America. In the *Church Quarterly Review* of April, 1881 (p. 16), a passage is quoted from Baron Wilhelm von Humboldt, in which he denounces all attempts by the State to "regulate" marriage "by laws, or through the force of its institutions to make it repose on anything save simple inclination." The whole passage is worthy of attention, and it is followed in the same page by the comment upon it of a writer in the *Westminster Review* (January, 1870, pp. 87-88). "As society is at present constituted, the full measure of personal liberty with respect to our sexual relations here contended for, unspeakably desirable as we hold its attainment to be, cannot perhaps be practically accorded . . . . . But towards the attainment of it there is a growing movement, particularly in the United States, and to some extent in this country and on the continent. . . . . The primary objects of marriage are the happiness and comfort of the parties to it; and it is susceptible of every variety of form which their consent can establish if it be not contrary to those objects. . . . . The terms [of the contract] whether as to the incidents or the duration of the connection, should be left to the choice and discretion of the parties themselves."

Here, then, is the prospect which is opened before us while we are invited to acquiesce in the fresh steps of relaxation of the marriage law of this Church and Realm. "Surely in vain the net is spread in the sight of any bird!" But the indifference with which the results of the Divorce Acts have been treated causes serious misgivings as to the tenacity of resistance which churchmen are prepared to exhibit to the further threatened changes in the marriage law. It is true, of course, that compared with the laws of some other countries, the English law of divorce is restricted. It compares most favourably with the corres-

ponding law in many other countries; in that, though it extends a provision which I believe was never intended so to be stretched, it takes its stand upon our Lord's words of exception, *παρεκτὸς λόγου πορνείας*, and confines itself to this as the justifying cause of divorce; whereas in some other countries the divorce law acts in the very teeth of our Lord's words, and allows divorce *κατὰ πᾶσαν αἰτίαν*, these causes being adjusted to meet the growing appetite of claimants. It is true further, that, compared with the statistics which I have just quoted from American writers, the record of the English divorce courts is moderate. But, though it is comparatively moderate, actually it is very formidable. The average number of decrees absolute in the five years ending 1879, was 256. The nineteen years of the divorce law ending in the same year, saw 3,462 decrees absolute pronounced. It is impossible to face these figures without misgiving when one reads in Dr. Nathan Allen's paper the following words relating to the progress of this evil in America. "Formerly there existed in the public mind a strong sentiment of indignation against divorces, and all the better classes were not slow to express a marked disapprobation of them. But the sentiments of the people have changed; divorces have become more common, and no class in society is exempt from them" (p. 555). So it is in America. So we cannot but fear it may be in England. There are symptoms that the plague has begun. To the opinion, for it is nothing more, that in this country the sentiment of the people would place obstacles in the way of greater relaxations of the marriage laws, the question of Dr. Pusey may be taken as only too reasonable a reply. "Have Englishmen alone the power to stop where they will? Have they a privilege of their own to break down the first barriers, and then to stop inconsistently, although they shall have put it out of their own power to plead either the Divine law or the rule of the Church, or instinctive feeling, which they would have already violated, as a ground against further changes?" (*Marriage with a deceased wife's sister*). That was an evil day for the cause of social purity and morality when the House of Lords suffered itself to sanction an Act of Parliament pronouncing a divorce *à vinculo*. The truth is that in the passing of that Act was laid the foundation of the Divorce Act of 1857. So fatal in their results are the first steps of departure from strict obedience to God's law.

The Church is bound to bring this before the conscience of the nation; and to do all in its power to reinstate in its true position, as the institution of God, the subject of Divine revelation, the marriage law. And for this she must evoke her disciplinary powers. There are not wanting encouragements to this. It is an encouragement to this course to find from American authorities—1, that among Roman Catholics recourse is never had to the civil tribunal for divorce; and 2, that in the Puritan communities, where discipline is most in abeyance and entire individual liberty is claimed, the number of divorces is excessive. "One thing," says Mr. Woolsey (p. 248), "stands out prominently, and that is that the commonwealths founded by the Puritans, and the parts of other States settled by their descendants, seem to be the chief abodes of divorces. That portion of the country which was settled by the most moral and intelligent of all the settlers from the old world. . . . . which ought to set the brightest example, is now cited to reveal its

shame, as being in this respect (of divorce) the most sinning and the loosest. What shall we say then? . . . . Shall we say that their ecclesiastical polity broke them up into independent Churches, and encouraged unduly freedom of thought and disregard for a common standard of action; that this freedom begat individualism, and this again, weakened the family principle, and made marriage less sacred than it was before?" The same rule seems to hold good in Switzerland, according to the report of the Bureau of Statistics at Berne, quoted by the Geneva correspondent of the *Times*. After saying that Switzerland is still the most divorced of European countries, even "Saxony, where divorces are by no means few, lagging far behind the confederation," and that the number of divorces in 1881 was greater than that of any previous year on record, he gives the following items: "In some of the older cantons, Uri, Obwalden, Nidwalden, and Appenzell-inner-Rhoden, no divorces were either asked for or pronounced. In Appenzell-ausser-Rhoden, the Protestant half of the canton, the proportion of divorces to marriages in 1881 was 13.18 per 100, the highest in the Confederation. In Thurgau, the proportion was 9.22. In Geneva, 7.89. In Zurich, 8.68. In Lucerne, 1.48. In the Valais, 0.18 per cent.; the purely Catholic cantons being always much less given to divorce than the Protestant and mixed cantons." It would seem, therefore, that in this matter the presence or the absence of discipline governs the results. 2. It is an encouragement further to this course to know that the Church in America, in view of the great evils of the system of divorce, actually passed, in 1868, a disciplinary canon regulating the solemnisation of re-marriages; and another canon several years afterwards guarding the sacraments from profanation in such cases. 3. It is an encouragement to hear the plain positive words of the Metropolitan of the Canadian Church, in which he lays down the duty of the clergy in the case of incestuous marriages, and which would apply equally to the so-called re-marriage of divorcees. "You may ask, what are we, the clergy, to do? I answer plainly, You are to decline to solemnise such marriages. If the State relax its obligations, and pronounces marriage a civil contract only, the Divine law and the law of our Church is still binding upon you. You are to be guardians, not betrayers, of public morals. Nor ought persons who live in incest to be admitted to holy communion."

But even if encouragements were wanting, still some rules must be formed for the guidance of the Church. They are necessary for these reasons. 1. Unless the Church lays down rules, or takes care to make known that she holds the old rules to be still in force, she is compromised by the acts of individuals done under cover of new state enactments. There have been in previous legislation, and will be probably in any fresh legislation which may be attempted, clauses for the relief, so called, of the clergy; but, however well-intentioned (and we are bound to recognise the considerate intentions with which they were introduced), such clauses provide no relief for the Church at large; and if adulterous and incestuous unions can be contracted under cover, however irregular, of the Church's blessing; or if adulterous or incestuous parties can be, however irregularly, admitted to the communion by clergy of the Church, by those acts the Church will be compromised unless she plainly repudiates them by distinct utterances. 2. It is not

to be supposed that in the absence of direct Church discipline, the clergy at large will consent to be, as Bishop Medley says, "betrayers of public morals;" they will not consent to deprave and sacrilegiously dispense the sacraments. But if they shrink from this, then, in the absence of authoritative directions, they must administer discipline each man according to his own private views, and the guidance of his own conscience. See, then, what it really comes to. This question as to the right course to be adopted in the cases under consideration, involves so many dangerous and critical issues, that the authorities of the Church have been unable to come to any definite conclusion upon it. But then, failing this, they leave this most delicate and difficult point, from the determination of which the Church shrinks, even though she may bring to bear upon it all her wisdom, collected after any amount of deliberation, to be settled, perhaps at a few hours' notice, and without the possibility of seeking counsel, by the private opinion of the clergyman before whom the case comes, and by whom it must be forthwith dealt with. I say that it would be an act of the extremest cruelty as well as of suicidal folly to leave any clergyman, whether he be priest or bishop, in such a condition. 3. No one can lightly regard the danger of collision between the civil and the ecclesiastical authorities, which must almost inevitably arise from any such disciplinary rules as have been suggested in this paper. Yet it must be said on the other hand, that a careful survey of the various marriage acts from the Reformation downwards, made by the Archdeacon of Oxford (whose absence we all deplore, and certainly none has better reason to regret it than myself), leads him to the conclusion that "an advocate of our legislature might contend with some fairness that from first to last the general view has been maintained of respecting prohibitions contained in 'God's law' (by which Holy Scripture is plainly intended) and none other." With regard to the Divorce Act itself, he thinks that this contention would be fair. We have the right then to hope that in the future, as in the past, the State will abide by God's law, if the decisions of that law are authoritatively stated. We may remember further, that we have the authority of Mr. Gladstone for the recognition of the necessity of some such discipline, which it is only fair to suppose he considered practicable; because, when he suffered himself to yield to the pressure of what he, erroneously as I believe, judged to be public opinion on the question of legalising marriage with a deceased wife's sister, he did so with the express proviso that it was a necessity that in such case every religious body should maintain in this respect its own discipline. It is, therefore, perhaps not extravagant to hope that serious collisions might be escaped. But, whether or no, certain it is that such collisions must arise if the Church allows things to drift and stands helplessly by. In the presence of the "Churchman's Union," a society formed to encourage the solemnisation of incestuous marriages by clergymen in our churches, so soon as the civil law forbidding them shall be relaxed, it would be foolish not to recognise the likelihood of an attempt to force upon the clergy what many of them would certainly regard as sacrilegious communions. Again, as divorces increase in number, and, under cover of a gradually lowered public opinion, offenders against the law of God become more self-asserting, cases will multiply where communion will be claimed by persons who, in the

judgment of the Church, are living in sin. Further, in the constant migration to this country of persons who are domiciled in countries or in colonies where the law of the land is more lax than our own in regard to divorce, re-marriage, and incest, it will more and more frequently occur that the same question of admission to or repelling from communion will arise. And in every such case, unless the Church speaks plainly and takes order, it will be left to the individual clergyman to decide what he shall do; whether he shall yield to pressure, and so commit the Church to complicity in what she holds to be sin; or stand out, and so commit the Church to a conflict with the civil authority.

For the sake, then, of reviving the belief in the existence of a Divine law of marriage; for the sake of neutralising for the moment the evil consequences of the change in the civil law of divorce, of preparing in the future for the amendment of that law; for the sake of checking any further departures by the State from the Divine law, whether in the direction of increased facilities for divorce or of the defacement of the Table of Prohibited Degrees; for the sake of guarding the clergy in their conscientious resistance to what they believe to be wrong; for the sake of guarding the sacraments of the Church from profanation; it is of necessity that the Church should speak out plainly and authoritatively on this subject, and that without delay.

The Ven. J. A. Hessey, D.C.L., Archdeacon of Middlesex.

My Lord Bishop of Oxford,—You have desired me to read a paper on the objections which cluster about the proposal to alter the existing Law of Marriage, so far as to permit a man to contract a union with the sister of his deceased wife.

I obey you without preface or introduction.

The objections to such an alteration may be classed roughly as (1) *à priori* and (2) *à posteriori* objections.

The former will include arguments against it—

1.—On *Scriptural grounds*, *i.e.*, because it contravenes the spirit, if not the exact letter of Scripture.

2.—On *Logical grounds*, *i.e.*, because the admission of it must in strictness of reasoning involve a great deal more than is contemplated, or at least than is generally avowed, by the promoters of it at present.

3.—On *Historical grounds*, *i.e.*, because it would go counter to the custom or enactment, or both, of the Church Universal down to the beginning of the fifteenth century, and of the Church of England both before and after the Reformation.

The latter, or *à posteriori*, will include arguments against it—

4.—On *Political grounds i.e.*, because the success of a measure pressed forwards by the means and with the motives which have in this case been brought into action, will weaken the obligation of law generally.

5.—On *Social grounds*, *i.e.*, because it will produce an utter breaking up of the particular relationship invaded.

6.—On *Ecclesiastical grounds, i.e.*, because it will greatly disturb, if not fatally endanger, the existing connection of Church and State.

I would willingly have spoken at length on all of these, but the time allotted to me—twenty minutes—is much too short for the purpose. I have elsewhere treated of the first two heads, in a tract probably known to nearly all present. I will, therefore, leave to those who are to follow me the handling of the Scriptural and the logical grounds.* This will permit of my treating, though more briefly than I could wish, of the historical grounds of objection, and enable me, I hope, to dwell upon the last three, which show how miserable would be the effects of such a measure.

By asserting that the measure is objectionable on historical grounds, I mean this :—It would set at nought the best evidence by which a correct interpretation of Scripture is in this, as in other cases, ascertainable. This evidence is the historical practice of the whole Church down to the fifteenth century, and that of our own Church and nation since the Reformation. I have heard it urged with some pertinacity that in the very earliest ages of the Church these marriages were not prohibited. The fact is, that we have no sufficient proof that they occurred. The first notice that we find of them is in the Apostolic Canons—a somewhat doubtful document, but probably, in parts at least, ante-Nicene. There, in Canon 19, one who had married a wife's sister is for ever excluded from the clergy. And what was so absolutely condemned in the clergy, could hardly have been creditable in the laity. But waiving this, it is an undoubted fact that St. Basil, living in the fourth century, spoke of marriage with a wife's sister with extreme horror, and as opposed to the practice among Christians delivered down to his day by holy men. This means that the common law of the Church was against it. After and about his time, such a marriage, and others prohibited, expressly, or by inference, in Leviticus, were condemned by councils, and generally disallowed as contrary to the law of God. Laboured efforts indeed have been made to prove that this was not so. But the statements brought forward are found, when carefully examined, to be quite beside the point. Putting aside Jewish interpretations, not a single authority has been produced which bears upon our question before Nicholas de Lyra, of the fourteenth, and Alphonsus Tostatus, of the fifteenth century. No doubt a great many additional restrictions as to marriage with cousins of various degrees, and even with persons of spiritual or sponsorial affinity, were introduced as time went on. But there is documentary evidence that the Church of Rome, which, from time to time, added so much to the table, and now, for her own purposes, considers all the prohibitions to be merely of Ecclesiastical ruling, and so dispensable, did not venture to dispense with this particular prohibition, or others contained or implied in Leviticus, until the fifteenth century. Then began a series of dispensations to kings and princes chiefly, culminating in that to our Henry VIII. to marry his deceased brother's widow. Mr. Froude says that this dispensation was reluctantly granted by the Pope, and reluctantly accepted by the English ministry. It was not, however, till 1563, that

* This Paper has since been published in a separate form, with the objections on Scriptural and logical grounds filled in. In all other respects it stands as given here.

the Council of Trent formally asserted the power of the Church to dispense "in *some* of the degrees named in Leviticus," but without specifying which. A decree passed in the same session of the Council forbade any dispensation to be granted in the second degree, except to crowned heads, and for some cause of grave public interest; thereby implying that in the first degree they could never be allowed at all. Cardinal Manning has said recently that the Holy See can alone dispense in such cases, and that it never dispenses in such cases, except, (1) rarely; (2) with reluctance; and (3) for grave reasons, and to avoid greater evils. That permission is not refused was manifested in the instance of Don Carlos, the Spanish Pretender, who troubled Queen Isabella. He had two wives, sisters to each other, and both of them nieces to himself. In Roman Catholic countries dispensations are more or less frequent, while, in Protestant countries, possibly as a reaction from the super-additions of Rome, extreme laxity as to relationship prevails. And coincidently with this infringement on the original prohibitions, great facilities of divorce are supplied.

And now for England itself. No statutable prohibition even of the unions mentioned actually in, or inferentially gathered from Leviticus, and formulated in the table, existed until the Reformation began. But why? Because, when Christianity came to England it brought the common law, as I have called it, of the Church with it, and "Christianity became (as Mr. Dodd has well put it), and is still reputed to be, part of the common law of England. And so it became part of the common law of the land that marriage with a deceased wife's sister was unlawful. The prohibition was part of the law of England before any act of Parliament was ever passed, or indeed any English Parliament existed." No wonder, then, that, as we have said, the English ministers accepted the dispensation to Henry the Eighth of the collateral prohibition with reluctance. It was an innovation which shocked the moral sense. And probably this consideration, combined with one quite in the opposite direction—that of impatience at the vexatiousness of Rome's superadded restrictions—rendered the Parliament the more ready to pass the 32nd of Henry VIII. c. 38. By this it was laid down that "no reservation or prohibition, God's law except, shall trouble or impeach any marriage without (*i.e.*, outside of) the Levitical degrees." The effect of it was, not to enact those prohibitions as of force for the first time, but, leaving them as they were, to assert the unlawfulness of any other prohibitions. It simply continued what lawfully existed, on the definite and intelligible ground of God's (not the Pope's) ordaining, and of the Levitical degrees. Shortly afterwards, in Elizabeth's reign, the table was formulated by Archbishop Parker, and has been printed at the end of our Prayer Books.

Of course the limit which the table propounds may be called an arbitrary one. Granted that it is. But, by universal consent, a limit must be made somewhere. And the particular limit which has been made, namely at the third degree, is, if there is anything in what has been urged hitherto, of Divine appointing. It is a *limes* DIVINO ARBITRIO *impositus*. Beyond the third degree of consanguinity and affinity, by Divine regulation a line is drawn; and no one may presume to lay down another line:

"Sunt certi denique fines
Quos ultrà citràque nequit consistere rectum."

Well, the common law of England and of the Church, as cleared from all accretions, and set forth in its simplicity by statute, prevailed without interruption to 1835. Marriages within the degrees were, in the language of our 99th Canon, void from the beginning, in the sense that no woman could claim alimony, or restitution of conjugal rights, as a married person, from her pretended husband, if she had contracted such a union. Again and again, they were declared void in the Ecclesiastical courts—if impeached during the lifetime of both parties. Before the reign of James I., they were declared void, even after the death of one of the parties. But, as suits in the Ecclesiastical courts were nominally for the prevention of sin, by the breaking off of cohabitation, and, as this was unnecessary after the death of one of them, the Civil courts limited declaration by the Ecclesiastical courts of the void character of the unions, and consequently of the illegitimacy of the issue of them, to the lifetime of both. Practically, therefore, they were only voidable, though intrinsically void from the beginning. And this technicality having given something like an excuse for them having been contracted, and some plausibility to the plea that the children were kept in undue suspense as to their position, Lord Lyndhurst's Act, to remove all ambiguity, and to remove all shadow of doubt or pretence of ignorance, set forth that, henceforward, without any waiting for a declaration on the part of the Ecclesiastical courts, they were to be considered void from the beginning.

One would fain believe, had it been possible to do so in the presence of the more than rumours of 1835, that this act was passed solely from the motives which are set forth in its preamble. But it is impossible to do so. For, though the relief was expressed in general terms, there is little doubt that, as the Church of Rome commenced its system of dispensations to meet the exigencies of princes, so the statute in question was carried through in order to meet the purposes of a certain noble family.

I have now completed all that I have time to say of what I called *à priori* objections to any change in the law. But my treatment will not be exhaustive, without a consideration of what I have called *à posteriori* objections, viz.: the disastrous effects which will follow, setting aside for a moment the inherent iniquity of the alteration itself.

The obligation of law generally will be weakened, if this measure passes. The alteration cannot now be said to be called for by any mistake on the part of the real promoters of it. They have been well aware what they were about. The pleas they have alleged, like those which have been mentioned already, are not to be depended upon. It has been proved that the poor do not call for any alteration, and that, in fact, their feeling is strongly against it. But, even were this not so, would it be right to legalise sin?

It has been proved also that no general and genuine cry for relief has been raised. But, even if it had, the legislature would still be bound to pause in a case relating to the law of God.

And so with two other pleas of which abundant use has been made:

It has been shown over and over again that, though a few important names of judges and peers and bishops have been quoted in favour of altering the law, such judges as the late Lords Campbell and Hatherley, the late Mr. Justice Coleridge, the late Lord Chief Justice Whiteside,

the late Sir Herbert Jenner Fust, with Lord Cairns, Lord Coleridge and Lord Selborne, have invariably opposed it; that such lay peers as Lords Shaftesbury and Salisbury, the late Duke of Marlborough, and the Duke of Argyll are found on the same side of the question; that in the recent divisions in the House of Lords, twenty-four out of the twenty-six bishops having seats there either voted or paired against the measure; that the late Premier, Lord Beaconsfield, disliked it and voted against it in 1879 and in 1880, and that one of the best speeches ever delivered against it was by the present Premier, Mr. Gladstone. If authority and intelligence are any counterpoise to mere numbers, they may have a place here.

It is urged that children are visited for the sins of their parents in this particular case. But, as I have observed elsewhere, if they are to be considered in this instance, what is to be said of the children of other incestuous unions, with or without the form of marriage, or of illegitimate children generally, or of children who, through their parents' extravagance and vice, have a miserable inheritance of poverty or diseased constitutions? It is not man but God who has ordained the relation of the sin, or of the righteousness of parents to the condition of their children. "I, the Lord thy God am a jealous God, and visit the sins of the fathers upon the children unto the third and fourth generation of them that hate Me, and show mercy unto thousands in them that love Me and keep My commandments."

The fact is, that certain persons have broken or desire to break the law. And an agitation, now extending through almost fifty years, has been carried on by a profuse expenditure of money, with the view of obtaining a legalisation of their acts or intentions. And, in order to gain their end, they have first exaggerated by hundreds the number of instances in which the law has been broken, and then urged that it must be a bad law because it has been broken. It is obvious to remark that such a plea proves much more than they want or profess to want. The laws of kindred and affinity have been transgressed in many points besides that in which they are interested. And it would tell against other laws than those which relate to marriage—in fact, against every law in the statute book, for the "Law is because of transgressions."

The preamble, then, of a bill on the subject should be, "WHEREAS it is expedient that whenever a law has been broken, or confidently alleged to have been broken, it should be repealed: And whereas certain parties have, at great cost, raised a cry that the law forbidding marriage of a man with his wife's sister has been broken: And whereas it is expedient that a particular alleged grievance should be redressed, without reference to any considerations how far such relief may bear inconveniently on the general law involved: And whereas it is expedient that no man's liberty should be restrained for the general good: And whereas all such checks on the power of Parliament as were contained in old statutes, such as in the sixteenth century, in 25 Henry VIII. cap. 22—'Albeit they be plainly prohibited and detested by the laws of God,' and the like, are out of date in this nineteenth century: And whereas divers foreign nations have got rid of such reference to the laws of God, and it is expedient that their example should be followed: And whereas it is expedient that any legislation which has occurred in the Colonies should not be merely sanctioned there, but be adopted as a law of the

Empire: And whereas permission of marriage with a deceased wife's sister is part of the legislation which has occurred in the Colonies: Be it therefore enacted by the Queen's Most Excellent Majesty, by and with, etc., that from the date of the passing of this Act, a man shall be permitted to marry his deceased wife's sister, any prohibition in the law of the Bible, or in the table of Archbishop Parker, and any ordinance or custom of the Church Universal, or of this particular Church of England, or in the Canon or Common or Statute Law notwithstanding."

Now, this is hardly a caricature; but, even if it is, would an act which may so be caricatured weaken or strengthen general respect for law? What, with such an example before us, might we not expect in the future?

It is bad enough when misrepresentation, and money, and perseverance combined bring their influence on Parliament and destroy some merely human institution. It will be most miserable, and augur sadly for the State and Church which endure it, that such efforts should succeed in impairing a Divine law.

But what will be the effect of this alteration of the law, socially?

It has been already intimated that if the law is weakened by one invasion of principle, other invasions of principle must necessarily follow. Instances have been adduced which show that the supporters of the bill not merely look forward with expectation, but with hope, that a woman's marriage with two brothers, and a man's marriage with his niece, and certainly all marriages of affinity, will follow in the wake of the concession to a man that he may marry two sisters. But I will not dwell upon these more remote effects. I will just mention one that is immediate.

At present a wife's sister is in most cases thrown into such intimate connection with a man's family that she is regarded as his own sister. She is in his household as freely as his own sister, in his wife's illnesses and troubles. She is a most confidential friend of both parties, and at his wife's death she may live under his roof without suspicion, and become, during his widowhood, the kind educator of his children. No matter whether she is young or old, no reproach can attach to her. As the wife, when alive, is unable to look upon her as a possible successor in wifehood, so, after the wife's death, the world has not a word to say against her assuming an office which might, in any other young woman's case, lead to wifehood or unlawful connection, and might, therefore, be regarded as dangerous. The poor especially enjoy such adopted sisterhood, and the prospect of such motherly care being bestowed upon her children has frequently consoled a wife's dying bed. But not the poor only, but those of the middle class, and even the opulent. Are they to be deprived of this comfort? I remember that a distinguished member of Parliament, being then a widower, said to me many years ago with great indignation: "Since my wife's death I have enjoyed the greatest consolation in securing a most kind aunt's care for my children, and a most kind sister's ever-present attention for myself. Am I to be deprived of this because a few selfish persons have determined, *coute qui coute*, to abolish sisters-in-law; to prevent my having my children's aunt in my house, unless I am prepared to make her my wife? Granting for a moment that a sister-in-law or aunt is one of the best guardians for

my orphaned children, why divert her affection from them to children of her own? Why convert her into a possible step-mother? Even if the law of God were not against this union as incestuous, the dictates of the most ordinary rules of prudence would set us against legalising it as inexpedient."

Let me add that it is notorious that the feelings of the great mass of women are even stronger, if possible, against the measure than those of right-thinking men. And, moreover, that it is very hard that a maiden sister-in-law, perhaps without any home but her brother-in-law's house, should be unable, after her sister's death, to enjoy that protection any longer. If one were to compare the two relationships—that of wife's sister and that of husband's brother—it would almost seem that the former, which is not expressly mentioned in Leviticus, requires hallowing by a Divine sanction more than the latter which is expressly mentioned. A sister is more frequently, from the circumstances of the wife and from her own unmarried position probably, brought into contact with her brother-in-law, than a brother into contact with his sister-in-law. Of this, however, by the way. I only pause to ask, are we willing to abolish sisters-in-law?

Lastly, what will be the effect of this alteration of the law on the discipline of the Church, especially in reference to one of its holiest ordinances, the Holy Communion, the consciousness of those who partake of it, the position of priests who celebrate it, and eventually of the Church itself, if this measure is passed? I will endeavour, as my last point, to show you this.

You are aware, of course, that the 99th Canon of our Church speaks on the subject of marriage in the following terms: "No person shall marry within the degrees prohibited by the laws of God, and expressed in a table set forth by authority in the year of our Lord God, 1563. And all marriages so made and contracted shall be judged incestuous and unlawful, and consequently shall be dissolved as void from the beginning, and the parties so married shall by course of law be separated. And the aforesaid table shall be in every church publicly set up and fixed at the charge of the parish."

The Canon thus sets forth that persons related within the degrees expressed in the table are forbidden by the laws of God to marry, and, as we have seen, the common and statute law of the land agree with the laws of God. The Canon also speaks of such cohabitation as incestuous. In like manner the Prayer Book itself, in the form for publication of banns, appeals to the congregation whether "they know of any cause or just impediment why the persons whose banns are asked may not be joined together in Holy Matrimony, and, if so, they are to declare it." Before the marriage is celebrated the parties themselves are solemnly admonished that if "either of them know any impediment why they may not be lawfully joined together in matrimony, they are then and there to confess it." For they are warned that "so many as are coupled together otherwise than God's Word doth allow are not joined together by God: neither is their matrimony lawful." And the Rubric goes on to say, besides this, that if any man do declare and allege any impediment why the parties may not be coupled together in matrimony, by God's laws or the laws of this realm, etc., the marriage must be deferred.

It is evident, then, that so far as our own Prayer Book is concerned,

the law of God and the law of the land, as to marriage, are at present regarded as coincident. It is further evident that persons related as a man and his deceased wife's sister, presenting themselves to be married, could (for the Prayer Book is part of the law of the land) be repelled as desirous of entering into an unlawful and incestuous engagement; and that if they have, by fraud or evasion, gone through the marriage ceremony, it is yet further evident that, if they present themselves for Holy Communion the priest may lawfully repel them as open and notorious evil livers (cohabiting in incest), until they have repented. And when this is reported to the bishop, the priest must be supported by the bishop, and the offending persons must be proceeded against according to the Canon. These latter points appear from the Rubrics at the commencement of the Communion Service.

At present, then, there is no difficulty in these matters. But what if the State-law contradicts the Church? It is evident that then every one of the sentences quoted from the Rubrics about the banns and the celebration of marriage becomes nugatory and a mockery, that the priest cannot celebrate marriage between a man and his wife's sister. But an alternative may be suggested—the State may have pronounced it lawful for them to be married before a registrar; they are thus no longer in the eye of the law of the land notorious evil livers. And it may be—it will be—that they present themselves for Holy Communion. Then how is the priest to repel them without incurring grave danger? And how is the bishop, without accepting the danger himself, to sanction the priest's act. Yet both bishop and priest must resist if they feel that it is better to obey God than to obey man. They must pronounce the marriage to be void in the sight of God. The matter goes into the courts; and the Church being an Established Church, and admission to the Holy Communion being asserted to be a Common Law right, and it being shown that the marriage is not forbidden by the laws of the land, and it being assumed that the State could not in its wisdom have ordained anything contrary to God's law, the bishop or the priest, it may be, is sent to prison, and a conflict begins between Church and State which may issue in the consummation of the wildest wishes of the Liberation Society.

It is not to be supposed for a moment that this is an imaginary danger. The Divorce Act may warn us of this. A clergyman is not compelled to marry divorced persons, but he is not allowed to refuse permission to any other person, if he objects to perform the ceremony himself, to marry them. He will probably tell his parishioners that he does not consider them married at all. They present themselves for Holy Communion. He refuses to admit them—what then? He must either admit them, or he must evade doing so. A case of this nature actually occurred. The parties consulted the late Dr. Stephens. He advised that they had a right to be admitted, and could maintain that right in the courts. The conflict ended, in a manner no one could wish it to end, by the clergyman absenting himself, and by another clergyman officiating for him.

It is clear, then, that though a measure for permitting marriage with a deceased wife's sister may contain some clause like that contained in the Divorce Act, which may appear to relieve a clergyman's conscience by giving him permission to refuse to officiate, or by relegating the office to

a registrar, such relief must very soon be found inadequate. No clause will meet the ultimate difficulty except one which shall expressly say, "No clergyman shall be permitted to receive to the Holy Communion any parties who have contracted matrimony within the prohibited degrees." It will not be enough to say that no clergyman shall be *compelled*, for, if any clergyman were at liberty to receive such parties, the Church would be compromised, and the congregation offended. "No clergyman shall be *permitted*," must be the form. Whether it is likely that such a clause will be acceptable to, or passed by, the Legislature of the present day, I leave you to judge. If the Bill does not contain it, then, I say, comes that last conflict between Church and State of which I have been speaking.

I am told that a society is in course of formation which is to contend that the clergy shall be allowed to perform such marriages. This point gained, admission to Holy Communion would soon follow.

Such, which God may avert, would be the consequences to the Church of making what designing persons denominate, and easy-going but ill-informed persons passively or actively join in denominating, the small concession of legalising marriage with a deceased wife's sister.

It was not a small concession, but a grave national sin, in 1835, to validate retrospectively marriages of such a description, and others against the prohibited degrees, out of respect to persons—though it was veiled under specious pretences of charity to children, and warning for the future.

"Fecunda culpae saecula nuptias
Primum inquinavere et genus et domos."

The Divine Law of Marriage was to a certain extent impaired. And

"Hoc fonte derivata clades,
In patriam populumque fluxit."

We are called upon to validate prospectively and perhaps retrospectively one phase of incestuous marriages—for ever. Let us pause, for a few months' time is allowed us, before we make up our minds to admit anything of the sort, out of respect to mere money.

If this miserable Bill of Lord Dalhousie's, or anything like it, becomes law, see what will take place.

Holy Scripture, the virtual interpretation of Holy Scripture by the Church from the beginning, Canonical Law, the 99th Canon of our own Church, the religious feelings of the best disposed in our community, will all be set at nought. The authoritative Table of Prohibited Degrees, hitherto considered to be founded on the moral law, and to represent God's will, and thoroughly consistent with itself, will be maimed, and its remaining prohibitions reduced to a collection of dislocated human enactments. And many of these may be, as mere human enactments, and will be, repealed by-and-by. Consistency and cohesion will have disappeared; nay, I can discover no reason, on the supposition that nothing is forbidden that is not forbidden *totidem verbis* in Scripture, why, even if some respect for Leviticus remains, a man should not be allowed to marry his own daughter. Thus there will be all sorts of complications, utterly breaking up the sacredness of family life. Then there may be even the dreadful spectacle of clergymen contracting such incestuous connections as the law will then allow, or, possibly, persons

in very high station. Then there will be the situation of the Crown, and of the House of Lords, of whose all-but sanction of the measure, and of the character of the influence almost successfully brought to bear upon it recently, I will not now speak particularly; and of the House of Commons, in its tone, so far as this measure is concerned, ready to promote the views of the Liberation Society. And then there will be the position of the clergy. Can it be supposed that if some of them would go to prison rather than be coerced into abandoning a Eucharistic vestment, which they believe to be legal, a vast number will not suffer great hardships rather than admit to the Holy Communion those whom they believe to be not really married, according to the Divine law? Before these days of ours, priests and bishops also have endured such things for the truth's sake. It is true of ecclesiastics as well as of soldiers, that

> "Not once or twice, in our rough Island's story,
> The path of duty was the way to glory."

And then will not the relations of Church and State, already strained, be strained to the uttermost? And then—but I will not further anticipate.

Shall we not imitate our adversaries, and be lavish of our means? Shall we not use our best efforts to diffuse sound information on the subject in order to avert all this? And shall we not use another weapon, which cannot be really theirs, namely, prayer, that "God's continual pity may cleanse and defend His Church?"

We will do so, and find the words of that noble hymn come true—

> "O God, our help in ages past,
> Our hope for years to come!"

ADDRESSES.

The Right Hon. G. Sclater-Booth, M.P.

I desire to approach the subject of the marriage laws, from the point of view of the politician rather than of the theologian. Not that I wish to shrink from or undervalue the theological arguments. One, indeed, of the two branches into which they seem to divide themselves, has always appeared to me much more cogent than the other; not the less so because it rests on analogy, on authority, and on a comprehensive view of religious speculation, rather than on the direct interpretation of Scriptural text. But, to put the point shortly (and then I leave it), the great paradox enunciated in Genesis ii. 24, "they twain shall be one flesh," supported by the well known references to it in the Gospels and Epistles, and illustrated by eighteen centuries of usage and practice in the Christian Church, seem to me to lay a far safer and more reliable foundation for that identification of affinity and consanguinity as regards the prohibited degrees, which is so great a stumbling block to many minds, than the passages in Leviticus, which are, to say the least, of doubtful bearing under any other than the Jewish dispensation. But, while we accept and rely on Revelation, and the dogmas and practice of the Church in support of our marriage laws as we now have them, it cannot be denied that in this nineteenth century, if the principle of them be challenged, the battle has to be fought in Parliament, nay, even on the hustings, and

it is most important from that point of view, that arguments of a political, or semi-political character should, if reliable, be brought to the front, or at least not be left, as it seems to me they sometimes are, altogether in the background. I desire, therefore, to point out what, indeed, is evident enough to those who examine the division lists of the two Houses of Parliament, but what is, nevertheless, a matter too little appreciated in the outer world, that, as a political question, reform of the marriage laws is not one which can with any propriety be said to form part of the liberal creed. There is, in fact, no right analogy between the reforms, liberties, and emancipations of various sorts and kinds which have been from time to time achieved for the people of this country, through the action, or, at least through the initiative of the Liberal party, and the liberty, or freedom from restraint, in the matter of marriage, which is sought for by those who have promoted or supported the passing of a Deceased Wife's Sisters Bill; nor can the captivating term "Liberal" (the attractiveness of which even a Conservative can appreciate) be with justice applied to the agitation having that specific object in view. Indeed, I would make bold to go a step further, and to lay down the proposition that the restraints of the Christian marriage laws are not only limitations on freedom, but are marks of Christian liberty in the highest and best sense of the term. What is, after all the most salient feature of freedom since the establishment of Christianity? Is it not the emancipation of women? and is not the barrier which the marriage laws extend round the status of women, the most significant sign and symbol of that emancipation? Compare the social condition of the Christian family with that which prevailed in those periods of Greek and Roman history when there was the greatest love of and passion for liberty, as then understood, and when the most heroic and splendid sacrifices were made in support of its sacred principles. During those centuries the influence of women was almost unrecognised in the state. Again, what is the distinguishing characteristic, I may say the "differentia," between the Mahommedan and the Christian worlds—that which separates them, as it were, by an impassible gulf, that which must ever prevent the union or harmonious working together of the two religions,—and which, in spite of some admirable moral and intellectual qualities which we recognise in the former, renders complete sympathy between them unattainable? Is it not the dependent and degraded position of the weaker sex in the one case, and the recognised rights and privileges which are theirs in the other? The harem seclusion on the one hand, which is bound up with, and inseparable from domestic slavery, and the emancipated condition on the other, leading to all those family and social influences of inestimable value to morality and order in the State, which distinguish their position under the Christian dispensation?

Miss Lydia Becker, an able and eloquent advocate for woman's rights, sees this with unerring instinct when she speaks of the proposed bill, as being "unequal as between husbands and wives to the advantage of husbands;" and again she points out, most truly, that it would "tend towards a reversion to the Oriental idea which would limit the relation of women to men to the marriageable relation," and therefore, that, "the relaxation of the law relating to marriages of affinity would tend to degrade women."

I am not, of course, arguing with those advanced thinkers, who, confusing the idea of public liberty with that of personal license, desire to revolutionise society, and to sever altogether the marriage contract from the sanctions of religion; but speaking of liberalism in its widest and best signification. I say that it is not only consistent with, but depends on the social basis which we owe to Christianity. An instinctive feeling to this effect has evidently underlain the controversy on this subject, which has raged, with occasional breathing spaces, for the last forty or fifty years, because, in spite of the majorities in favour of the change which have been repeatedly gained in some (not in all) of our recent Parliaments, the cause, so to speak, has made

no appreciable advance towards a successful issue, and the failure of its advocates to improve their frequent victories has been received by the liberal public with significant equanimity. But although it cannot be denied that the opponents of the Deceased Wife's Sister Bill met with a heavy blow and great discouragement on the 11th June last, when the second reading was, for the first time, passed in the House of Lords by a small majority, and, although there was certainly not much to boast of in the equally small majority by which, on the 29th June, that decision was reversed, nevertheless, I cannot but think it an advantage that the subject has been so thoroughly thrashed out as it was in the two admirable debates of this year, and, especially, that so much weight was attributed by the opponents of the measure to the proposition, not contested on the other side, that under cover of this particular demand for amendment of the marriage laws, which, when viewed separately, and from a narrow standpoint, finds favour with many estimable people, the whole question of the prohibition of marriages of affinity is at stake. This has never, I think, been so thoroughly made clear to the popular conception before, nor so freely, I had almost said, so cynically, admitted by the advocates of the change.

Quotations illustrating this argument were here made from the speeches of Lord Cairns, the Duke of Argyll, the Lord Chancellor, and the Bishop of Exeter, delivered in the House of Lords in June, 1883, and also from addresses of Earl Beauchamp and the Earl of Shaftesbury made before representative meetings in London about the same time.

These things now so clearly stated and enforced by great authorities of the widest divergence in political bias, can never hereafter be mistaken or confused. That they have not always been so conspicuous a feature in the controversy may be due to the too frequent use on the other side of the ugly and ambiguous word "incestuous," which, as applied to marriages of affinity, revolts many minds; but, be that as it may, the country has been brought so near the precipice by the vote of the House of Lords, that I hopefully anticipate a reactionary impulse to date from this time, and that the advocates of the change will no longer be able to mask their batteries behind the comparatively slight shelter of the Deceased Wife's Sister, but will be driven to attack the table of affinity along the whole line. When this is once made clear as the real object and avowed intention of the attacking party, I am persuaded that the gravity of the change advocated will be more and more apparent, that it will be recognised as a struggle in which the status, nay the liberties, of women are at stake, and, with that, most of what constitutes the purity and sacredness, the civilisation, in its highest sense, of our domestic life. No political thinker, be he Tory, or be he Liberal, can have failed to notice the inter-dependence (in this country at all events) of domestic life and civil polity, nor can shut his eyes to the disastrous consequences to the latter, which would inevitably result from the degradation or demoralisation of the former. The object of my remarks is to draw attention to these larger considerations of public policy, with which, for the future, at all events, this question will inevitably be bound up.

John Walter, Esq., M.P. for Berkshire.

When Bishop Jewel was challenged by a learned man to give his opinion about certain words in Leviticus xviii., which seemed to warrant a man in marrying successively two sisters, he began his reply in these words: "I would ye had rather taken in hand some other matter to defend. For it is not the best way, in my judgment,

neither in these troublesome and doubtful times, to call more matters in doubt without just cause, nor in this intemperance and science of life, to open a gate to the breach of laws." Had Bishop Jewel lived in these days, which have certainly troubles and doubts enough of their own, he would probably have uttered his protest at Congress with still greater emphasis. For if there be any subject in the world upon which a general concurrence of opinion is more necessary to the welfare of society than another, it is surely the law which regulates the institution of marriage. Not even religion itself can claim precedence over it in this respect ; for a man's religious opinions he may keep to himself, his marriage he cannot. "A good marriage law," says the Report of the Royal Commission of 1868—adopting the language of Mr. Boyd Kinnear, who gave evidence before it—"a good marriage law ought to embrace the maximum of simplicity, and the maximum of certainty ; of simplicity, because it affects every class, and almost every person, the most humble and illiterate as well as the most exalted and learned . . . Of certainty, because it affects a contract and social relation, the most important that can arise between human beings, because it affects the foundations of society itself, and influences the fate—it may be the eternal fate—of innumerable individuals." If this be true as regards those regulations of marriage which relate to such questions as the respective ages at which marriage may be contracted, the hour and places at which, and the authorities, civil or religious, before whom they may be celebrated ; much more does it apply to the religious aspect of the subject, to this law laid down for our guidance in the word of God, and, until lately, accepted as such by the greater part of Christendom. No greater misfortune can befall society than to be divided into two contending factions upon a matter of this supreme importance ; one side being firmly persuaded that the maintenance of certain prohibitions is unauthorised by God's word, and is therefore an unjust restraint upon human liberty, while the other is equally convinced that the prohibitions are founded on Scriptures, and therefore cannot be repealed by human authority. Such, however, is unfortunately the condition in which we find ourselves at this moment. A controversy, of which the issue is yet doubtful, has divided society upon this subject for the last half century ; battles have been fought in Parliament with alternate success ; and as in the game of the tug of war, the contending sides are sometimes reinforced by unexpected allies, so has it happened in this case. Meanwhile, the public at large—so far as I am able to judge—have been watching the struggle with curiosity rather than excitement, swayed by the authority of names or of parties, perplexed with the conflicting arguments on each side, and only waiting till the balance of evidence, presented in an intelligible form, inclines decisively to one side or the other.

In contributing my quota to the solution of the problem, I will occupy the few minutes at my disposal by stating (1) What was the law relating to this branch of the subject prior to the Act of 1835. (2) What was the effect of that Act, and (3) Which, in my judgment, are the main reasons against the change proposed in the Marriage Bill as last presented to Parliament. According to Blackstone, the law of England considered marriage in no other light than as a civil contract. The holiness of the matrimonial state was left entirely to the Ecclesiastical law, the temporal courts not having jurisdiction to consider unlawful marriage as a sin, but merely as a civil inconvenience. The punishment, therefore, of annulling incestuous, or other unscriptural marriages, was the province of the Spiritual courts, which act *pro salute animæ*. But such marriages were not void *ab initio*, but voidable only by sentence of separation. They were esteemed valid to all civil purposes, unless such separation was actually made during the life of the parties. For, after the death of either of them, the Courts of Common Law would not suffer the Spiritual court to declare such

marriage to have been void, because such declaration could not lead to a reformation of the parties. And therefore, when a man had married his first wife's sister, and, after her death, the Bishop's court was proceeding to annul the marriage, and bastardise the issue, the Court of King's Bench granted a prohibition *quoad hoc*, but permitted them to proceed to punish the husband for incest. And be it observed, that, under this state of the law, not only marriage with a deceased wife's sister was capable of being contracted without being *ipso facto* void, but all other marriages within the prohibited degrees might be contracted with similar impunity; subject, however, like the former, to the risk of a suit in the Ecclesiastical courts which, if successful, would render them void. The consequence was, as Sir W. Follett explained, that parties married within the prohibited degrees, lived together as husband and wife, and had children; it was at the option of any person—though in one particular mode of proceeding—to make that marriage invalid, and the children illegitimate; and, worse than that, it was at the option of either of the parties, indirectly, to get the marriage declared invalid. How it happened that for so many generations of lawyers and statesmen such a preposterous state of things should have been allowed to exist passes my comprehension. All that can be said is that it is not more extraordinary than the muddle which seems to have existed in every other department of law, and from which modern statesmen and lawyers have been doing their best to deliver us. The scandal and mischief resulting from this state of the law had at length reached such a pitch that, in 1835, Lord Lyndhurst got an Act passed with the view of putting an end to it. In its passage through the House of Lords it was supported and even strengthened by Lord Brougham, while in the House of Commons it experienced some vicissitudes, and was only carried by the influence of Sir W. Follett, who persuaded the House to re-insert at the last stage of the bill the second clause, declaring all future marriages within the prohibited degrees to be null and void, which it had actually struck out in Committee.

Now, the object of the Act was first to whitewash all marriages previously contracted within the prohibited degrees of *affinity* only, still leaving those of *consanguinity* to the tender mercies of the Ecclesiastical court; and secondly, to declare all marriages within the prohibited degrees, whether of *affinity* or *consanguinity*, to be henceforth absolutely null and void. Such is the history of the Act of 1835, which, strange to say, excited so little interest in the country that no mention of it whatever, beyond the mere title of the Act, is made in the Annual Register of that year. Such being the state of the law, it was proposed in the Marriage Bill lately before Parliament to take out of the list of prohibited degrees the particular case of the deceased wife's sister, and to pass an Act of Indemnity for the benefit of those who had violated the law in that respect since 1835. But without wishing to prejudice the case of these unfortunate persons, it appears to me that there is all the difference in the world between the position of those who have contracted such marriages since the Act of 1835, and of those who did so prior to that Act. The Act of 1835 condoned the transgression of the law in a particular class of cases, on the ground that the defective machinery of that law had encouraged its transgression. It took the blame on its own shoulders and whitewashed the offenders. But while doing this it laid down the law for the future in the most distinct terms. It declared all such marriages hereafter contracted to be "absolutely null and void, to all intents and purposes whatsoever." No act could be more binding, no language more explicit. To select, therefore, a single class of forbidden marriages for the retrospective indulgence of Parliament, to claim for the parties who have transgressed the law the restitution, as it were, of rights of which they have been unjustly defrauded, without the slightest regard to the case of others who might urge equally strong claims

to consideration, is a specimen of amateur legislation for which, I believe, it would be hard to find a parallel.

But as the case of the deceased wife's sister is the only one which it has hitherto been attempted to except from the prohibited degrees, let us consider the arguments which are mainly relied upon in support of such a change. They are, I believe, 1. That in Leviticus xviii. 16, an implied sanction is given to such marriages. 2. That the wife's sister will make the best stepmother to the children. 3. That there is no reason why affinity should be any bar to marriage. 4. That, as society is divided in opinion on the subject, the marriage in question ought to be permitted, because it only concerns the parties themselves. Now, to take these arguments in order, I would observe, first, that if the marginal rendering of the text ("*one wife to another*") be correct, the argument derived from this verse falls to the ground, and the passage resolves itself into a simple prohibition of polygamy; an interpretation which I think is far more reasonable than the other, because I cannot conceive that, in the case of polygamy, the wife's sister is the only one whose presence would be likely to cause discomfort in the family. Besides, as Bishop Jewel observes, "There be otherwise women enough to have choice of, so that no man can justly say that necessity drove him to marry her whom, in common manner of speech, he first called sister."

2. The argument that the sister-in-law will make the best stepmother, simply begs the question. It can only be a matter of opinion at the best, and it is certainly not held by many who are quite as good judges of such matters as those who maintain it.

3. The argument mainly relied upon, and which lies at the bottom of this question, is that affinity should be no bar to marriage. But it is to be observed that those who use this argument have not the courage of their opinions. They have not proposed to relax the bond of affinity in the case of the brother's wife, the wife's niece, the step-daughter, or the other prohibited degrees of affinity; when pressed for an answer to this they can only say, "Oh! we have no objection, but at present there is no demand for such marriages." But can it be sincerely contended that restrictions upon marriage founded *ex-hypothesi* upon a Divine ordinance, are to be relaxed from time to time, as the demand for their relaxation arises?

4. But it may be said that, admitting that there is much to be said on both sides, no hardship would be inflicted upon those who do not wish to marry their wives' sisters by the concession of that privilege to those who do. But a change of this nature in the law of marriage affects, not only the *status* of those for whose sake it is made, but also that of society at large—of all those whose social relation to each other is changed by virtue of such an alteration of the law. Society does unquestionably permit much greater familiarity and freedom of intercourse between persons within the prohibited degrees, than it does to those outside them; and therefore every man's position with regard to his sister-in-law would be placed on a different footing were the restriction on their marriage removed. It is sometimes said that such marriages are not uncommon in the United States, and that they are not attended with any bad consequences. But if they are common in the United States, it by no means follows that they are a sign of progress. The custom exists among the Red Indians as well, and in Schoolcraft's history of those races I find it stated, that with respect to the Kenistenos—a branch of the Algonquins—that "when a man loses his wife, it is considered his duty to marry her sister, if she has one; or he may, if he pleases, have them both at the same time." I am told that the same custom prevails in many other tribes. But if an exception is to be made in favour of the wife's sister, on what ground is it to be refused to her niece, who is further removed from her in point of affinity, and is often quite as well fitted in other respects to take her place? Again, on what ground is it to be refused to the brother's widow, the analogy between whose case and that of

the wife's sister was held by such authorities as Bishop Jewel and Jeremy Taylor to be complete? I know that analogies will not bear straining too hard; and I have heard it argued that there is the same kind of difference between the two cases as there is between polygamy and polyandry, and that there is a natural repugnance to the latter which there is not to the former. But just as the red Indians allow polygamy, even with the wife's sister, so did our British ancestors practise polyandry. Julius Cæsar has told us that by far the most civilised race amongst them were the people of Kent, and this is the account he gives of their marriage customs: "*Uxores habent deni duodenique inter se communes: et maximè fratres cum fratribus, parentesque cum liberis.*" So difficult is it to say to what lengths people may go, when once their minds are unsettled upon the subject of marriage. There is no doubt that in these days free and easy notions prevail in some countries on the subject of divorce, and, in a little book of advanced opinions on things in general which I was reading the other day, the author suggests that every three years or so married couples should be allowed to reconsider their position. It is not, I believe, generally known that at a certain period of the French Revolution, the page in the *Moniteur* which recorded the births, death, and marriages, headed the list with "divorces," in the proportion of about one to five of the marriages, occasionally in a much greater proportion. In conclusion, it appears to me that there are but three possible courses open to us in this matter. (1) To maintain the prohibited degrees of affinity intact. (2) To abolish them altogether. (3) If they are to be partially relaxed, to find valid reasons for limiting the exception to the case of the wife's sister. I believe the last to be logically impossible; I do believe that the country would shrink from adopting the second, and I therefore hope and trust that it will abide by the first.

Extracted from the *Moniteur* of October 26, 29, 31, 1793.

ETAT CIVIL.

October	25.—Divorces 7.	Marriages 24.
,,	26.—Divorces 6.	Marriages 30.
,,	27.—Divorces 6.	Marriages 9.
,,	28.—Divorces 7.	Marriages 31.
,,	29.—Divorces 7.	Marriages 28.
,,	30.—Divorces 6.	Marriages 10.
November	4.—Divorces 5.	Marriages 30.
,,	5.—Divorces 1.	Marriages 22.
,,	8.—Divorces 6.	Marriages 29.
,,	9.—Divorces 9.	Marriages 34.

DISCUSSION.

The Right Hon. A. J. B. BERESFORD HOPE, M.P.

DEEPLY sensible as I am that it will be difficult to add any arguments to the masterly paper of the Archdeacon of Middlesex, and the most telling, logical, and convincing speeches of my two hon. and right hon. friends, without trespassing upon your patience, I must speak upon this question from another, but what I think is an equally practical point of view. You have had the danger that is looming ahead so graphically pointed out to you; you have had the evils described with such a careful masterfulness of hand in all its ramifications, that the question must have come home to all of you, What are we to do to avert the evil? And that is a very practical question—a painfully practical question to us all since the divisions of last session. In another point of view, I must say I have had a revelation which is far from pleasant to me. It is the

fact that the nation, to an extent which I had not previously realised, requires to be educated again upon the matter. Twenty or thirty years ago, when the question was very rife indeed, when the controversy was a subject of frequent and keen and very able Parliamentary debates—more able, I think, on the other side than what we have heard lately; for I do not think that with all the artificial nursing—dry nursing, and wet nursing, and hot nursing—with which it is sustained, that there ever was a speech so able on the other side—very sophistical, but so able as that of the late Lord Chief Justice Cockburn, the one great jurist who shows in an undesirable contrast to his brethren who came forward in favour of the change. At that time the people were fairly educated. The case was sent round the country clearly and plainly put out. For some years past it seems to have gone asleep. In the meantime the world wagged on with many changes, and I make no doubt that there has been much underground working on the part of the apostles of innovation, and so it comes to pass that a good deal has been done now to recover leeway. I do not blame those whom the danger does not pinch; for, of course, nothing is so difficult as to make the people believe in and master the existence of the danger whilst still occult, when it seems to have been removed. So the success of last session would be dearly bought if there was the least risk of anything like that chronic apathy coming on again. But we must all unite. Who was it said that when bad men conspire good men must unite? I do not call our opponents bad men, but I only call them very illogical, and very selfish, and very sophistical, and very unscrupulous, and people whose ideas of facts is a fantastic idea of what fact and truth mean. But they are very good people indeed; and how are we to deal with these very good people? I say we must unite. I detest upon all occasions appearing to be the chapman who cries up his own wares. But in this case all that kind of modesty must be thrown aside, and although a member of it, I must point to an organisation which does exist, and was created for the purpose of resisting this agitation—I mean the Marriage Law Defence Union. There has been for many years the Marriage Law Defence Association. How does this union differ from it? It differs from it because the association—the old association—was exclusively a Church of England body. Now we feel that although this question is pre-eminently—and in this Congress room especially—a Church question, it is also a people of England's question, and therefore that it would be betraying our cause if we refused the succour of those who are not members of the Church of England. And so at our society we have by the side of leading Church of England men—by the side, for instance, of the Archbishop of Canterbury, who is our patron—by the side of the President of this Congress, who is one of our committee-men, we have leading Scotch Presbyterians, leading English Dissenters, and we have a bishop of the Roman Catholics in England. This union, I say, has started on that broad basis. Whilst taking up all that is good and all that is Churchlike in the old association, we admit the religious argument as put forward by the other bodies of Christians, and we also put forward the social argument as advanced by all citizens. Such is our aim, and we ask you to help us. Do not go to sleep; do not confine yourselves to cheering here, but form local associations; communicate with the union; get possession of the literature which is put at your disposal and very easily distributed. In O'Connell's words, "Agitate, agitate, agitate" for the maintenance of our present marriage laws.

The Rev. Dr. LEIGHTON COLMAN, of the Diocese of Ohio, U.S.A.

I FEEL as though the fact of my being an American ought to make me hesitate before interposing in the discussion upon which so many of your fellow-countrymen are very anxious to speak to you, and you are as anxious to hear them. And yet I will not hesitate when I think of the growing closeness of that bond which unites us together, and remember the loving closeness of which I have been so happily reminded during all the session of this Congress. And as I look at the other end of the room and see the motto which has for its divine sanction, "That they all may be one," and see the flags of the two nations intermingled together; while I speak of this unity between us, for it is a theme upon which we delight to dwell, as oftentimes we are tempted into the region of controversy and bitterness; as I dwell on this theme of growing unity between the two nations and Churches I should be very recreant of the feelings which I am sure will actuate all my fellow-countrymen, if I do not say how thankful they are because of the message sent from this Congress

to Philadelphia to-day. They respond, I am sure, most heartily. There are not a few there who, day by day, during the session of the Congress, will be praying to your Father in heaven for His blessing upon our deliberations here. It is this very unity which has encouraged me to accept the invitation so cordially given to me this afternoon to address you, but I will do so very briefly, because, although there are many statistics given here this afternoon to the detriment of your good opinion of the country from which I happen to hail—statistics which, unhappily, I am not able to deny, and which I should be very sorry to palliate—still, notwithstanding those damaging statistics, I would venture to ask you to remember that in all these matters the Church, as the Church, has her skirts clean. Her legislation upon this subject is clear and pronounced, and it has been so from the beginning. When, about 100 years ago, our Church became independent of England, it was one of the most earnest anxieties present upon the minds of American churchmen that you in England should understand from the outset—as I hope you all understand now—that while there were changes in the Prayer Book, made necessary because of the political revolution, yet in matters of doctrine, discipline, and worship, our Church would not depart from the Church of England in the improved—allow me to emphasise that word improved——part of the provisions of our Prayer Book. It seems unnecessary to enumerate all the alterations, and it is to be hoped that the reasons of them will appear by comparison of our book with the Book of Common Prayer of the Church of England, in which it will also appear that our Church is far from intending to depart from the Church of England in using points of doctrine, discipline, and worship further than local circumstances require. I ask you to what extent can this connection be more properly applied than to the one under consideration now? Therefore, I claim that in the matter of the marriage law, the American Church is at one with yourselves and the declarations which you have made—official and unofficial. I think I am not wrong in this supposition, and perhaps you will allow me to refer you to the case of the House of Bishops as long ago as 1808, when, sitting as a council, they resolved as to marriages that the English law of affinity should be the law of the American Church, and I think it was not proved to disagree with the Word of God and the practice of the Early Church. While there is no law, either ecclesiastical or civil, which forbids marriages within the prohibited degrees, yet let me say that there is no clergyman compelled to solemnise such marriages, and I know many clergymen who not only frown upon such marriages, but utterly refuse to have anything to do with their solemnisation. In the absence, therefore, of any legislation to the contrary, the American Church teaches, so far as our moral consciences are concerned, that which is in exact accordance with your Table of Affinity. Whether we legislate any further or not, it still remains true that the Table of Affinity as found with you is the same as found with us. Therefore, I ask you, in the absence of any specific legislation upon this subject, either by the State or the Church, to help us in maintaining sound sentiment upon this important subject. It is upon that account that I venture to speak as earnestly as I can, because I am aware of the fact, which I trust it is not discourteous here to refer to, that much of the agitation in the United States that has arisen in favour of marriages within the prohibited degrees has been exported from your own country, and therefore it is that I ask you to inspire us, who are endeavouring to stand with you, with some of that firmness which was shown by the House of Lords on a recent occasion, and of which we have such good reason to hope—nay, to know—that hereafter the whole bench of bishops will give fresh illustrations, if those illustrations are needed. The ringing words of your President will be repeated in America, and I know how they will cheer the hearts of the American bishops there, and it is therefore that I ask you that, in considering resolutions upon this point, you will not only do that which affects the welfare of England, but that which affects our welfare too. It may be, and no doubt it is, a fact which we have reason to lament, that such marriages are sometimes celebrated there. But in a recent letter I have received from an old and influential bishop of ours, he told me that during his long and parochial experience, he was never asked to celebrate such a marriage, and his experience agrees with that of many other parish priests. He adds that which many other parish priests would also say, that, when those marriages do take place, many members of the family of each party hang their heads in mortification and shame. Therefore, while we have a deal in America for which we have reason to weep, still I hope there are many of us there who are brave enough and consistent enough to stand by the declaration of the House of Bishops made in 1808, and still to recognise as, at least morally, binding upon us your English Table of Affinity, and I ask you, therefore, to stand by that which you and I agree together in thinking is in accordance with the Word of God and of the practice of the Church.

The Rev. M. W. Mayow, Devizes.

The Archdeacon of Middlesex, in his excellent address, told us that he proposed to deal chiefly with the political and social aspects of the question of the Deceased Wife's Sister Bill; but would leave it to other speakers to treat of the Scriptural question. I wish to occupy a few moments with a word upon this, because, as you are well aware, it has been asserted, and I think some people seem to believe it, that the Scriptural prohibition is invalid. Now, I believe that there are three reasons chiefly relied on for this assertion, one of which was advanced by a noble lord in the debate last year, and it is, that we are not, as Christians, under the Mosaic law. It really seems to me that it is impossible to fathom the depth of ignorance to which some persons may sink. Whoever supposed that we were living under the Mosaic law? though no man is free from the moral precepts contained in it. But surely it is evident that the prohibitions in Leviticus are especially directed against the *nations of Canaan* as well as *God's own people.* They speak of these marriages as abominations for which the people of Canaan were cast out and destroyed, and surely *they* were not under the law of Moses. Therefore, to say we are not under the law of Moses, has no bearing at all upon the question. Secondly, it is asserted that this prohibition of Scripture does not exist, because the express mention of the deceased wife's sister does not occur in the prohibitions, though that of the brother's wife does. But if you look into the express words of Leviticus, you will perceive that although a man is expressly prohibited from marrying his grand-daughter or step-daughter, or step-grand-daughter, there is no express word of prohibition that a grandson may not marry his grandmother, or step-grandmother; and there are many other like cases where the prohibition is left to be inferred on the one side from that on the other, and if you do not take the parallel cases, you will find the most frightful kinds of incest to be not prohibited. The third point, and that I think chiefly relied upon, is the 18th verse: "Neither shalt thou take a wife to her sister, ... beside the other, in her lifetime." Here the advocates of the bill are ready enough to draw inferences. If not in her lifetime (they say), then after her death. But is there no reasonable and fair interpretation of the 18th verse, which will not bring it into flat contradiction to the 16th? I do not wish to go into the question as to what appears as the marginal reading (which, however, you are aware, has many learned men on its side), but I would point out that there is a reasonable account to be given of that passage, without in the slightest degree bringing it into contradiction to the general prohibitions of the law. It appears to me (and it has appeared to many others) that this prohibition exists only as relating to the law of the Levirate, viz.: That when a man dies childless, his brother should take his wife to raise up seed unto his brother. In the case alluded to a man was to take his brother's widow in order to raise up seed, and to prevent the extinction of a house in Israel. We will take the case then of two brothers, A and B, marrying two sisters, C and D. Say the eldest brother dies childless, and his wife, C, is left a widow, but she is the sister of the wife D, of the second brother. Then he is forbidden to take her to wife by this 18th verse. Then the prohibition comes in as an exception to the law of the Levirate. "Neither shalt thou take a wife to her sister . . . beside the other in her life time." No, not even to prevent the extinction of the family! And therefore that verse thus finds its place and application; and this, be it remarked, is no modern invention to meet an objection. For it is that which Dr. McCaul told us was the interpretation of the Mishnah, and of all the Jewish Rabbis, and of himself, and was always maintained by the Jews to prohibit a man taking to wife his brother's widow, even under the law of Levirate, if his own wife, her sister, were living. Surely this brings the matter to a reasonable sense without any over-riding of the prohibition of the 16th verse, that the woman shall not marry two brothers, or the parallel case that a man shall not marry two sisters! I would only say further that the crisis in which the Church of England found herself in connection with this matter between St. Barnabas' Day and St. Peter's Day, this year, appears to me to be the greatest crisis this Church and kingdom has gone through since the martyrdom of King Charles the martyr.

The Rev. CANON TREVOR, Beeford Rectory, Hull.

I WISH to say a word upon one part of this question on behalf of the people among whom I dwell. I live in a remote country village where there is no science, no law, not even a policeman, and no sort of progress. We call ourselves an agreeable, independent people, which means we are intensely jealous of our own convictions, and never accept the argument of an outsider. There is only one authority to which we all submit. Now this marriage question is argued on many grounds. It is a question of law and logic, a question of Church authority, of civilisation, of social life, and the family purity—all to my mind very solid and sufficient issues, and on no one of them, as your lordship observed yesterday, have the advocates of the Sister's Marriage Bill a word to say for themselves. A noble lord (whom your lordship will doubtless remember) treated it as a question of physiology. He would prohibit the marriage of first cousins because they are of the same blood, but this does not apply to a wife's sister, and, therefore, he supported the Bill. This may strike you as a novel and eccentric argument; but the noble marquis is a great authority on the turf, and his opinion probably swelled the contingent of youthful senators, by which the Prince of Wales was enabled to rout the Lord Chancellor, the Chief Justice, and all the bench of bishops, on a question of law and religion. All this our village takes notice of. But our opponents did put in an answer upon one question, even before they were pressed upon it. The great popular Tribune, who threatened the bishops with expulsion from the House of Lords, took care to say that thousands of the best Christians in the country knew the prohibition to be unscriptural. A learned law-lord, too (whose acquaintance with the sacred volume must have come upon Westminster Hall as a surprise) gravely assured the House there was nothing against these unions in the Bible. Well, now, that is exactly the point that tells with our village. We have not got to divorces, but when we talk of marrying a sister-in-law, they always say, "Please, Sir, show it to us in the Bible." In spite of Biblical criticism, and the Revised Version—which I take good care they never hear of—our village believes in the Bible. They believe the harvest to be the gift of God—knowing nothing of evolution or the conservation of forces; and they will go to church on a week-day for a Harvest Thanksgiving, if for nothing else. They believe the Lord's Day to be of Divine institution, and not a farmer or labourer would go to work on a Sunday to save the harvest itself from perishing. In point of fact, our village habitually makes a costly sacrifice to the Fourth Commandment of the very bread by which they live, without a murmur, and without so much as a thought of it; while your townspeople, who indulge in Biblical criticism and the lodger franchise, cannot be got to sacrifice their recreation, or the refreshment so indispensable to its enjoyment. Well, now, I want the Church to go to the country with this marriage question, on the broad ground of the Bible. It is the simplest and easiest issue of all. In the very beginning of the Bible we read that God created man male and female, and blessed them, and said, "They twain shall be one flesh." It is all in that. The Levitical degrees mark the returning flow of inspiration after the disastrous ebb of the Fall. It is important to observe that all the marriage prohibitions of the heathen—for there was never any community that had not more prohibited degrees than we have, none in which marriage was so free as with us—all those ancient races reckoned the kindred either exclusively on the father's side, or exclusively on the mother's side. The Hebrews—the people of God—were the only early nation who reckoned it alike on both sides, on the Divine principle of the one flesh; and further limited the bar to the fourth degree, instead of extending it into the endless restrictions of caste. Then, in the New Testament, the Author and Pattern of redeemed humanity takes us back again to the time of man's innocency, overrules all the hardness of men's hearts by the *dictum* "from the the beginning it was not so," sets anew the broken notes of that sweetest of all concords yet lingering amid the dissonance of life, and exalts this blessed relic of a Paradise lost upon earth into the type and pledge of Paradise regained in heaven. Let the Church, then, take her stand upon the Bible. Blow this trumpet with no uncertain sound, and you will call the people to your feet. Let the bishops meet the peers and princes in Parliament, with an open Bible, and say, "This thing ought not to be done; it is forbidden of God!" Under this standard you will conquer. But if the Church quits her stronghold to meet society on its own ground, society will beat you, and do worse than expel the bishops from the House of Lords; it will retain and utilise the bishops. It is ever thus, as all history warns us, that great empires decay and pass away. Not so much from the vice and unbelief of the lower class; frightful as that

danger is, there is hope if the head and core be sound. It is when the luxury and sensuality of the highest class bursts the bounds of religion and law, that the poison descends into every corner of the body, till the land itself casts it out with all its abominations.

The Rev. SIDNEY PHILLIPS, Rector of Nuneham Courteney.

I SHOULD not have ventured to address the meeting; were it not that I have a practical matter to bring before you bearing upon the marriage laws. It is but a few weeks since that I was talking to a layman who feels very strongly upon this subject —I do not feel at liberty to mention his name, but, I may say this, that since the death of his wife, his sister-in-law has lived in his house, and had the care of his children. Therefore, he looks forward, with great alarm, to any change in the marriage laws. He said to me: "I am very much surprised that the clergy do not circulate in their parishes, and put up in their churches, some plain statement of the marriage laws of the Church of England, together with an explanation of the Table of Kindred and Affinity." I myself have feebly attempted to carry out his suggestion, and I hold the result in my hand now. The paper is not sufficiently large for many people in the Congress Hall to read it; but I will, with your lordship's permission, just draw the attention of the meeting to some few points in the paper. I do think that it is necessary that our people should have something more than the mere Table of Kindred and Affinity without note or comment. We ought to teach our people. They see that a man may not marry his grandmother, but they ought to know why. First of all, it would be a great advantage if the degrees of kindred or consanguinity and affinity were printed in different colours—that is to say, if those of affinity were printed in red—you would then be able to see at a glance that twenty unions of affinity are forbidden, and only ten of consanguinity. Then again, I think it would be a great advantage (and I cannot see that there could be any possible objection to it) that the texts from Leviticus should be added to each degree. It would be seen then, that in fifteen instances out of thirty, the unions are distinctly forbidden; and that in the other fifteen the prohibition is implied by analogy, and in those cases an asterisk has been attached on this paper. Of the forbidden degrees, it would also be seen, by the adoption of different colours, that no fewer than ten unions of affinity are directly forbidden by the Bible, and only five of consanguinity. I would remind those who would look to the Bible for a direct prohibition in every case, that there is no direct prohibition against a man marrying his grandmother, his daughter, or his niece. On the other hand, it is distinctly forbidden by the Word of God that a man should marry his aunt—whether it be the wife of his father's brother, or the wife of his mother's brother. It is distinctly forbidden —however much he may wish it—for a man to marry his mother-in-law or his stepmother. It is distinctly forbidden for a man to marry his wife's daughter, his son's wife, his brother's wife, or his wife's granddaughter. Now, I think that any reasonable person ought to admit that sufficient instances have been given in the Bible to establish the principle upon which our Table of Kindred and Affinity has been constructed. Then I would add a short and very plain statement of the marriage law of the Church of England, which rests upon the teaching of the Word of God. I think it may be summed up in a very few words—that it is unlawful for a man to marry a descendant of his father or mother, and the same law necessarily applies to a woman, who may not marry a descendant of her father or mother; and, as the union in marriage is so intimate, that our blessed Lord Himself has said, "They twain shall be one flesh," the Church has always considered that the husband must regard his wife's kindred as his own kindred, and the wife in like manner must so regard her husband's kindred. Nothing to my mind could be clearer than the concise statement of Archbishop Cranmer, who said: "All the degrees prohibited, in my judgment may be best expressed in these general words, that no man may marry his mother, nor mother-in-law, and so upwards in *linea recta;* daughter, nor daughter-in-law, and so downwards in *linea recta;* sister, nor sister-in-law; aunt, nor aunt-in-law; niece, nor niece-in-law." And, upon this principle, the Table of Kindred and Affinity has been constructed. Let it be borne in mind, that no part can be touched or altered without endangering the whole. Then I would add on the other side of this paper, a short and very plain statement of each of the degrees, which, although not directly forbidden by Holy Scripture, are forbidden by analogy, and in each case

the reasoning is plain. To take, for instance, the prohibition that a man should not marry his wife's sister—it seems so very clear. A man is forbidden by the Word of God to marry his brother's wife, or, in other words, a woman is forbidden to marry her husband's brother, that is, a woman may not marry two brothers. Does it not follow that a man may not marry two sisters; a man may not, therefore, marry his wife's sister? I should be very thankful if this paper in my hand were of any use to the Marriage Law Defence Union,* or any other like society. I know that it may be very much improved upon, but still I think that the suggestion made by my friend is a good one, and that something is needed for general distribution amongst persons who will not take the trouble to read a tract or pamphlet. I will only add, in conclusion, that the more I look into this question, the more strongly I feel—and everyone else who studies the question, must feel, too—that any alteration in the marriage law would be fraught with the greatest peril to this nation. At any rate, let me say this—I do not think that those who are vacillating on the subject, or those who have hitherto been in favour of the proposed legislation, should consent to any alteration of any kind, until the so-called marriage reformers shall tell them, and shall tell us, upon what principle they intend to construct a new Table of Kindred and Affinity. When we know upon what principle they intend to construct it, and if it is in accordance with the teaching of God's Word, then it will be time enough, and not till then—but they can never do it—to consider whether any of the proposed changes are possible. In the meantime, I do think it is our duty—the duty of us all—as loyal Churchmen, as Christians, as Englishmen, to oppose in every way in our power, any alteration in the marriage laws, which we firmly believe to have been framed in accordance with the will of Almighty God, and the teaching of His Holy Word.

Col. W. T. Makins, M.P. for South Essex.

The only apology I can offer for taking up a few moments at the close of the discussion upon this question, is that I am one of those who for the past ten years have watched very closely the progress of the discussions on this question in the House of Commons; and I have, I am afraid, incurred, with some amount of truth, the charge of having been guilty of "scandalous and persistent obstruction," because I have availed myself of some of the forms of the House for the purpose of postponing discussion on the question, the result of which, if voted upon, would have been a foregone conclusion. All that can be said about the question has been said before, during the forty years the question has been before the Parliament of this country, with varying results; but what took place in the House of Lords last session may have a beneficial tendency, because it will draw the minds of people to the nearness of the danger which is upon us. The injury may take place unless the Lords stand fast upon the point. I also think there is a good chance of their standing fast. Although by a great effort, by a combination of courtiers and sportsmen against the bench of bishops and the legal authorities of the House of Lords, the second reading of the bill was carried by a small majority, the moment they went into the discussion of the details in committee, the differences were so great that those peers who had voted for the bill on the second reading could not be brought again together to support it on the third reading. But at the same time we may look upon it as an escape, because, had the bill been passed by the House of Lords, very great pressure would have been brought upon the Government for giving facilities for its discussion in the House of Commons. As it now stands, it is something like a private member's measure; and it must be pretty evident to everybody who studies the want of progress of Parliamentary work that no measure of this importance has any chance of passing into law which is only fathered by a private member. If the Government were to take it in hand, it would in the present Parliament, should it pass the Lords, go through at once. But no Government is likely to devote the time that is necessary, and to court the discussion which would follow that bill unless it first got through the

---

*The paper is now published by the Marriage Law Defence Union, 20, Cockspur Street, Charing Cross, London. Copies may be had in two sizes. Large size, for hanging up in Churches, etc., 2d. each. Smaller size, for general distribution, 1d. each, or 9d. per dozen.

ordeal of the House of Lords. There are three classes of people with whom we have to deal who are supporters of this measure. First, those who have either contracted these prohibited marriages, or who have friends who have contracted them, or who desire to contract them. The second class will view with favour anything in the shape of legislation which will weaken the Church. To neither of those classes is there much chance of appealing by argument or reason. But there is a third class, far more numerous than either of them, who are simply actuated, or rather, not actuated, by indifference and ignorance, and by feelings of—I do not mean it offensively—spurious charity, because they are unwilling to say or do anything which would give pain to those who have contracted these marriages. Well, then, I contend, as to many of that class to which I have just referred, what has taken place will do as much good in showing what great danger must accrue if we begin to tamper with the tables of prohibitions, either of affinity or of consanguinity. The one argument mostly advanced by the indifferent class when you say that you object to this prohibition in the one case being removed, is "Why not? they are no relations." That is the only argument which, when I have expressed the wish that this bill should not pass, nine-tenths of the persons I have spoken to have used. I think what has been said to-day will, at any rate, prove what are the difficulties in the way of those who have taken up that ground, and hinder them from doing so in future. I am very thankful for the support afforded by the expression of opinion here to-day, for it will give strength to those of us who will continue to oppose, to the utmost of our power, the proposed change, which we regard with so much dread and disapprobation.

The Rev. THOMAS VINCENT, Rector of Pusey, Berkshire.

IN the five minutes remaining I can only reply to one or two assertions made by our opponents, and lately circulated afresh throughout the country. The first of these is the fallacy uttered by Lord Bramwell in the debate in the House of Lords on the 11th of June this year, which has been paraded for the purpose, it would seem, of making capital out of his lordship's legal reputation. His argument was that if you allowed relationship by affinity at all, then, all the wife's relations would be at once related to all those of her husband, and in proof he took the case of two brothers in one family and two sisters in another. "John," he said, "marries Mary, she has a sister Martha, and Martha becomes his sister, and his sisters are his brother's sisters. John has a brother William, but William cannot marry Martha because she is his sister." The fallacy of this statement is easily proved thus: all relationships must trace up to a parentage; as relationships by blood must trace up to parents in blood, so relations by affinity must be able to trace up to parents by affinity. The widower (John) must not marry his late wife's sister (Martha), she is his sister by affinity (his "sister-in-law"), because her father and mother are his father and mother-in-law. But John's brother (William) has no brotherhood or sisterhood with any of the family of John's late wife (Mary), except herself, who was his sister-in-law because, on union with his brother, she traced up to his (William's) own father and mother as father and mother-in-law. Where, then, is the value of the much paraded argument of this great legal authority? Another favourite argument of our opponents is this, viz.: That the "law of the Levirate" in Deut. xxv. 5, 6, by overriding in one instance the law of Leviticus xviii. 16, and xx. 21, shows that there can be nothing *immoral* in the union there forbidden. The reply to this is: that the Divine author of marriage and its laws, has an equally perfect right to make an exception to His general law, as to make that law itself; and man, to whom that law was and is given, and for whom the exception was made, has no power or right to question either. If he cannot comprehend the one or the other, or the congruity of both, he must accept them in faith. The finite cannot expect always and fully to comprehend the Infinite. Although the finite has sufficient proof that the Infinite God is also all-good, all-wise, and all-just, and orders nothing really contrary to either attribute. Morality (itself not an abstract idea, but a concrete) is the acceptance of God's laws as they are, whether in command or exception. Immorality is the disobeying either. Therefore the one exception to Leviticus xviii. 16, and xx. 21, does not depreciate their general force in the least. On the contrary, if we allow the common maxim "*exceptio probat regulam*," this exception testifies to the binding force in all other cases (and therefore altogether for Christians) of the general law, both in its letter and in its spirit.

TOWN HALL,

WEDNESDAY AFTERNOON, OCTOBER 3RD.

The Right Rev. the LORD BISHOP of CARLISLE in the Chair.

PAUPERISM AND THRIFT.

(*a*) FRIENDLY SOCIETIES.
(*b*) ALMSGIVING.
(*c*) TREATMENT OF PAUPER CHILDREN.

PAPER.

The Rev. W. L. BLACKLEY, M.A., Vicar of King's Somborne.

THE subject of "Friendly Societies, in their Relation to Pauperism and Thrift," on which I have been honoured by an invitation to address you, has been for several years past of growing importance, and is to-day, I am glad to say, of very rapidly growing interest.

Any popular movement whatever, which, while tending to diminish our national, exceptional pauperism—now so universally felt to be as great a dishonour to the nation as it is a misery to the individual—tends at the same time to promote the true self-denying efforts of thrifty-minded men towards independence, ought to gain the hearty sympathy of all honest Englishmen, the earnest, prayerful help of all religious Englishmen, and, for the sake of its special moral effect upon national character, as well as for its practical inculcation of Christian duty, deserves the earnest thought and attention of the Christian Church, and, I would fain believe, of, more especially, a Congress of Churchmen such as I address to-day.

But the subject, however interesting, appropriate, and even vital to national and religious progress, is one still surrounded by difficulties, obscured by ignorance, complicated by conflicting interests, and perplexing enough to induce many a one to shrink from its contemplation at the very first, either in dread of the trouble of mastering its details, or from hopelessness of devising safe methods to make that mastery, if ever gained, effectual to the bettering of the prospects of our fellow-men.

I have therefore thought it better to use the opportunity afforded me to-day, not to point out, however easy that might be, those exceptional errors in our existing laws, for which existing people are not to blame, or to advocate, however personally interesting to myself, any new method of my own or of others, more consonant at once with the principles of Christian policy and the dictates of common sense; but to spend my time in a strict treatment of the subject itself, "Friendly Societies in Relation to Pauperism and Thrift," by making you understand, as the alphabet of the subject, what we mean when we speak of

friendly societies—what they do, and what they might do. Then, to give our study some practical outcome, I will indicate what we, responsible as we are for brotherly help and friendly guidance in the way of independence and contentment to our poorer brothers, should, as friends and neighbours, and more especially as Christian friends and clerical neighbours, do individually with the friendly societies so numerous in our midst.

It may be roughly said that, even in the very wide and comprehensive legal sense of the term, all friendly societies are based on the principle of mutual insurance. And the law, let me beg you to remember, includes in its definition of a friendly society a vast deal more than most users of the term imagine. It is quite important that I should catalogue them, to show you how tremendous a mistake is made by persons who, ignorantly, taking the gross official returns of membership and funds of friendly societies, assume that all their members, because insured against some trifling contingencies, are necessarily provided against eventual pauperism.

The Friendly Societies' Acts include, besides our common idea of sick and burial societies, any number of others providing for old-age pensions, widowhood, support of orphans during minority, endowments, travelling (or out-of-work) pay, support in distress, replacement of boats, of nets, of tools, working men's clubs for social intercourse, separate burial payments, insurances of cows, horses, or pigs, and societies "for any benevolent or charitable purposes."

It is manifest that although most of these societies secure members against exceptional losses and rare contingencies, only those of two classes attempt, so far as they go, to secure men against pauperism.

The two classes are those which secure to their members payment in place of wages during sickness, and those which secure pensions in old age.

And these are contingencies for which nature and common-sense tell us men ought to provide in the time of health and vigour; *want of such provision being the main source of all pauperism.*

The other insurances I have classified may indeed foster thrift, but are in no sense preventive to *pauperism*—a term which we may define (in view of our existing poor-law system) as "a state of destitution which all thrifty men are compelled by law to relieve."

Payments for funeral expenses, though most praiseworthy, only secure the contributor from a very small part of pauperism—a part of pauperism which, of course, he can never consciously experience at all, since funeral expenses are only needed and payable after his death; such a provision for burial, as contrasted, and not as combined, with any provision for existence, is prudence applied to the wrong end, a *hysteron-proteron* providence, which only secures *post-mortem* independence.

Endowments for widowhood and insurance for support of orphans are, again, noble provisions in their way, but in no sense secure the contributor himself against personal pauperism; they are payments made for the eventual benefit of others than himself; while it is obvious that insurances paid in against loss by the possible death of a horse or cow, in no way help to keep the insurer from pauperism when his realised means have vanished, when he possesses neither horse nor cow, and has to depend for support upon the labour of his hands.

This statement of the legal comprehension of the term, "friendly society," as distinguished from our ordinary idea of such a one as really secures men from pauperism—that is, the sick pay and pension society —is important to remember.

For many glorifiers of friendly societies (who ought to know far better), from ignorantly applying the general totals of friendly society returns to only one class of friendly societies, lead men to suppose the number of persons actually providing, or trying to provide, against pauperism, to be more than twice as many as they really are.

For instance, because we are told the official returns for 1880 show a friendly society membership of four and a half millions, with estimated assets of twelve and a half millions, it is wildly assumed that four and a half millions of grown men are thereby independent of pauperism. This is triumphantly quoted and repeated all over the country, as proof that our nation is wonderfully provident and wonderfully well provided; though the statement carries its obvious refutation to those who know the absurdity of imagining that an average investment of £2 13s. can secure all men at all ages from destitution. But what is the fact? Firstly, that, roughly speaking, two and a quarter millions (or half) of these people *are neither insured for sick pay nor pensions*, but only for the payment of some trifling amount at death; since the members of "Collecting Burial Societies," as they are called, swell up this official total, and are not members of "Friendly Societies," in our ordinary sense at all. So much for half the numbers said to be providing; now, how are they provided? Their provision does not amount to 10s. each member! It is simple childishness, if not most wicked flattery, to tell these people they are provided against pauperism by any means.

Again, as to this half of the membership of so-called friendly societies, the registrar tells us that though the sum paid in as contributions amounts to £740,000, the amount paid out in benefits is only £309,000, or, in other words, that these poor people, or their representatives, are members of organisations so cruelly costly, so sarcastically called friendly, that these poor men only receive back eventually 8s. for every £1 they struggle to pay in.

Eliminating these members, with their small funds, from the general total, we find a membership left of two and a quarter millions, with funds of about eleven and a half million pounds. Of these, *one organisation* (the Manchester Unity) claims 1-5th of the members, and nearly half of the fund —*i.e.*, half a million members, and five and a quarter million pounds of funds, showing these to possess an average provision of nearly £10. Deducting these members and funds, we find, in round numbers, that there remain, out of the population of thirty-five millions, two million members in ordinary societies, with funds amounting to about £3 per man; common sense will decide whether, in face of the fact that the Manchester Unity finds £10 per member necessary to success, an average of £3 for all members of all other societies can be really deemed sufficient provision against pauperism in any reasonable sense.

This will show then, sufficiently for my purpose, the possible precariousness, so far as security of receiving benefits, of very many friendly societies. But I will here give you an instance of the actual precariousness of such a society.

In the very town in which we are assembled, I and some clerical brethren were called to task by the members of a friendly society (so-styled) for publicly calling attention to *its own statement of its condition.* This particular society showed (in round numbers) at a certain date, *by its own valuation*, a membership of something like 20,000, assets of £7,000, or about 14s. per member, and liabilities of £147,000!! or more than £7 per head deficiency! That society still exists, though attention has been called in Parliament to their enormous deficiency; nay, more, in consequence of stating that the society "*had*," at the time of his writing about it, instead of "*had*," at a date a few months earlier, such a condition of affairs, the Rev. Richard Hart-Davis, Vicar of Dunsden, near this town, who boldly warned his poor parishioners against trusting to it, is involved in a tedious lawsuit which has been going on for nearly a year and a half; the anxiety whereof we cannot relieve him of, but the costs of which I sincerely trust everyone truly interested in the protection of poor men's providence will be cheerfully willing to aid him to bear.

Now, if this be the condition of a society which makes its annual returns and sends in its quinquennial valuation, what may we assume to be the case with the multitudinous ones whose managers never even dare to register or enrol them at all? What an incalculable mass of miserable disappointment is destined to overwhelm the poor unsuspecting labourers contributing to such organisations, when the inevitable extinction of the club must come!

Let us now turn from the manifestly bad class to see whether those who show safe rules, and good valuation balance, are precarious or no.

Collectively safe they surely are; there is no reason to fear any bankruptcy of their funds; they are as sound as they can be made, and deserve hearty honour and support.

But their members, in the nature of things, are not *individually* safe, because their own power of contribution is precarious. The man who has paid in from his earnings for forty years, may earn nothing in his forty-first, and, being unable to contribute, may cease to be a member, and become destitute after all. Nothing, I may say in passing, can ever remedy this terrible risk, but a system of paying up one's whole contributions in advance, and the adoption of any such secure principle as this must be a matter of long advocacy and persistent education of our rising generation.

What, then, do I recommend as the course to be followed by my hearers generally in regard to friendly societies? I will tell you.

Firstly, study the subject. The general ignorance upon it, not merely in the rural districts, but everywhere, is perfectly stupendous; it does not in the least follow that even the facts of sitting in Parliament, or being called a statesman, can of themselves qualify a man for settling this most grave and pressing question, of how to discourage the spendthrift and do justice to the thrifty man. And you all, interested enough in this subject to attend this meeting, may make a matter of conscience to study it a little. A small apparatus will give you large information. Buy and read through, pencil and note-book in hand, the 4th Report of the Friendly Societies' Commission, published as Blue Book [C. 961], 1874, price 3s. 9d. Its study will equip you

with a good fundamental knowledge of the subject, which, well and kindly applied, may give you the happiness of being very useful to your thrifty-minded labouring fellow-men.

Secondly, agitate and enlighten opinion on this subject according to your opportunities. The day will come when people will see, as they are growing to do, that for the perfect prevention of pauperism, universal contributions; and for the perfect protection of poor men's providence, national security; and for the perfect contribution of that providence, lump payments in early life; will all be needed; and they will be more ready to follow, but with wiser provisions, the great example Germany has this year set us of actually establishing a national compulsory insurance. Agitate, meanwhile, for the common justice of checking the establishment, in future, of any new society which cannot show sound tables of contribution. Then, as the present bad ones must die out, the present good ones will stand and flourish, free from the destructive competition of bad ones, which tempt their members away by lowness of rates. And let no one fright you from this course by declaring you should let the "hard-headed, hard-handed working man" make his own provision. No one insists on their making their own watches, which is just as easy and far less costly. I honour the "hard-headed, hard-handed" working man, in the true sense of honourable manhood, and in the true sense of honourable work; but I am utterly sick of him in the sense of being called on to honour what is not honourable, and that by the lips of noisy spouters who make their living—and that no lean one—not by the work of their hands, but by the mischief of their tongues; who thrive by the working man's discontent; and who know that were he once contented for an hour, they themselves would be thrown on the sharp horns of that most horrible dilemma of either having to work or starve. These are the people, the interested people, generally officials of rotten, falsely-called friendly societies, who, when men propose some simple protection in the way of supervision and certification of rates, in order to protect poor men's providence from one of its greatest troubles and dangers, deafen our ears with the outcry, "Don't dare to meddle with the working man! Leave the working man free to make his own provision. The working man does not want your help to do his own business." And officials of some friendly societies ignorantly echo this stupid clap-trap, and foster the greatest enemy to the cause they have at heart; for they thus unconsciously sustain the villainous competition against their own good work, of that whole ignoble army of swindlers who offer impossible benefits, at infinitesimal cost, just to the poor, busy, unskilled "working man," who knows too little on the special and intricate subject of investment and finance to distinguish right from wrong, danger from safety, the sound club from the unsound. These interested rogues crying, "Leave the working man alone to make his own provision," are as audacious, but, unhappily, vastly more successful than a band of burglars would be, who called upon the public to abolish the police force as an insult to honest men. As that cry would soon be translated into plain English, "Leave the honest men's property to the mercy of the thieves," so the other cry, "Leave the working men alone to make

their own provision," amounts, in the mouths of these vampire officials, to exclaiming, "Leave *us* alone to rob our dear friend, the working man?"

Thirdly, where a club already exists in your neighbourhood you will most probably be asked to contribute to it, and your answer should be frank and ready, "Certainly I will help it according to my power, *if the club be sound.* Show me your rules, your annual report, your rates of contribution, your actuary's certification of the rates, and a statement of how many members are paying at those rates, *and how many at any other.*" If all these points be satisfactory, give them all you can, encourage them, become an honorary member, attend their feasts and their meetings, make the men know you, and show all the brotherly interest in them you can. There are too few societies of this sort in England for you to make the least mistake in joining such a one as this. Do not refuse because it may only make provision for sick pay, and leave pension unattempted. Half a loaf is better than no bread; and as you come to know your fellow-members, and they come, as they, poor, kindly fellows, soon will, to feel and value your brotherly interest in them and in their hard costly efforts after independence, you will be able to urge and influence them by degrees to try for pensions too. The Post-office pensions are as cheap and safe and simple as any, and have the advantage of being obtainable under conditions various enough to suit the purposes and wishes of any who will try to secure them, and I cannot but think that those who have means to help the poor man's cause can spend them no better than in aiding the pension purchase of the older men, to whom its cost must be far greater than to the younger.

This may sound like abandoning a principle I have always strenuously upheld, that every man should make his own provision; but to the older men to-day, under the ordinary conditions of labour and wages, this may not be possible. When—as the lazy people prophesy who do not care to take any trouble themselves in fostering providence and fighting pauperism—our nation, by the magic of its purely secular inculcation of reading, writing, and arithmetic, succeeds, without any modification of bad and corrupting Poor-laws, in making all our people into voluntary and fully-provided Odd Fellows and Foresters, such help as I have named will not be needed; but while we are waiting for this golden time, I warmly counsel the liberal aiding of the older men in the purchase of Post Office pensions, and should the day of universal voluntary providence, by any utterly unexpected fluke, chance to coincide with the auspicious morning of the Greek Kalends, we may then apply our money to other purposes with a good conscience.

Fourthly, if there be no good society in your neighbourhood, suggest to some of your independent-minded workers the introduction of one. Such societies are to be found if men will take the trouble. If, for instance, you stir the great Temperance subject (closely akin to this), remember that the Church of England Temperance Society has an organisation managed by Mr. Mark Knowles, who is to address you on this question presently, not limited to total abstainers, which can offer rates certified by the best actuaries in England, a secure quinquennial valuation showing a balance on the right side, and membership strictly in accordance with rule. You may cause divisions by introducing this

in a neighbourhood where as good a society already exists, but you cannot go wrong in a neighbourhood with no good club. Or, if your county organisation, like ours in Hampshire, can give those manifest proofs of solvency, support and encourage its operations; and be ready always to explain to your poorer friends the danger of the cheap and chancing the advantage of the sound and certified friendly society.

I have hinted what you may do. Now, one last word as to what you must not do.

Give no money—not one farthing—and no countenance—not a glance—to an unsound club. Many do this carelessly, fancying they are helping the provident, while in truth they are only encouraging the reckless. Give money and counsel to reform the errors of a faulty club, *if its members will reform it;* give no money or countenance to the bolstering up of deficiencies and the perpetuation of wrong. It is far easier to subscribe than to refuse; but be bold and just to do the right thing, in a kindly way. Thousands give their heedless guineas to bad societies, and sit at their annual feast, from the selfish notion that they are saving themselves Poor-rates; they are really only fattening the publicans. The officials of bad societies flatter the squires, and the parsons, and the distinguished visitors whom they invite to their dinner, only in order to represent to their dupes that an organisation which the squire subscribes to, and the rector dines with, and the county member belauds, must be sound, respectable, and safe; and so they add to the membership, and multiply the eventual pauperism and cost. If none of these persons, from weakness or popularity-hunting, would ever countenance a society unable to prove its solvency and safety, less harm would be done. However harsh and unkind it may seem at first to refuse the call to countenance a bad society, by purse or person, be steady and honest enough to refrain from it, lest hereafter one or many a poor broken-down, disappointed pauper may have to say to his companions, as the explanation of how all his efforts of independence ended in the workhouse, "I thought it must be all right, because the gentlefolks upheld it. They must have known better, and should have done better; they might have spoken the truth in time, to save us poor, ignorant men from roguery, and wrong, and ruin."

ADDRESS.

Mark Knowles, Esq., Barrister-at-Law.

Although I quite agree in every word that has fallen from the previous speaker's lips as to the plunder practised upon the working classes in the matter of thrift societies, I think, badly managed as many of them have been, they have been an unmixed blessing. In connection with all these movements there will always be professional men, who will live on their wits on the one hand, and eke out a first-class living on the other; and friendly societies are no exception to the general rule. For nearly one hundred years past very few persons in the upper walks of life have turned serious attention to friendly societies. They have been left, therefore, for the working classes to manage themselves, and now, when you take the subject up in

real earnest, you very soon discover the weak places. But I would urge you, do not, because you have done that, forget to say a kind word for even the bad men who have pushed the thing forward. Now, suppose we have one hundred men, representing every class of working men in the kingdom, and coming from a variety of places, and we want to do at the present moment, the best thing possible for them in the shape of helping them to secure themselves against sickness in old age, you have first to consider the locality from which they come. That locality may be badly drained—a regular fever den. It will be next in importance to estimate the absolute provision to be made for thirty years to come. Again, let us take them in another view. We have trades to consider. The agricultural labourer may be provided for in sickness at a small cost; but the butcher's man is a risky character, and still more is the fresh-faced man who drives the brewer's dray. People, in years gone by, would sooner invest upon the life of a brewer's man than upon the life of any other man; but we have cut our wisdom teeth, and we have discovered that that broad fresh face with the grin on it is the best name for death, and we cannot accept him at any price. Now you come to the man who is working in white lead, and then to the Lancashire weaver: all these various trades have to be considered, and the first-class friendly society must take into consideration these contingencies. Then you must go still further, and not say you will insure the man of sixty years of age side by side with the man of twenty, or the man of twenty side by side with the man of sixty; for experience has taught us that one will be subject to fourteen weeks' sickness in the course of a year, and the other to six days. It is utterly impossible to insure the two at one price. There are, therefore, three grave questions you have to begin to deal with. Now beyond that, if you have dealt with the district, the trade, and the ages, there is still one greater consideration, and that is the personal habits of the individual who is about to become a member of the society. I know in a meeting of this sort I am touching on tender ground. It is said that the extremely temperate man is as good a life as the water drinker. Take my word for it, the most carefully temperate man or woman in this room, or in any of your parishes, is not a life, so far as insurance is concerned, to be put side by side with the simple, plain, cold water drinker. That is a fact. However carefully you may examine both of them, the more completely will you come to the conclusion that the man who is absolutely a water drinker, who does not touch stimulants, who does not take snuff, and who does not smoke tobacco—that that life is very much better than the life of the man who indulges in stimulants, snuff, and tobacco. These are four great points which you have to consider, and if you give your utmost attention to them, you will do a great deal to remove the difficulties which Mr. Blackley has put before you. A man who saves his money by avoiding expenditure of these kinds has laid by when he becomes fifty a fund sufficiently large to provide for his old age. There are thousands of working men who, like myself, have found it in their power, with the assistance of friendly societies, to lay by in early life against their old age, a fund to provide for all their necessities. Having these four things before us, what are we to do? We should begin by estimating what is the average duration of sickness in a given number of years for one hundred persons. Then the subscription list must be large enough to cover the demands of the ascertained sickness; and with regard to the death-rate, we must provide for three deaths out of the hundred in each two years. There is, therefore, now a second contingency. Having provided for the sickness, and afterwards for the funeral expenses of these persons, we must not leave off here; we must find out how the ratio of sickness goes on, and, having found the average in our own society, we must provide the necessary payment at the least possible cost. The same course must be followed with regard to the death rate, and

then we must make the subscription per week or per month to cover both. Now, as to working expenses, I have come to the conclusion that Mr. Blackley is right when he says that in most of the societies we have now, 30 to 60 per cent. is engulfed one way or another in expenses. But I submit this is what you are responsible for. You who are better off could have come before to the front and taken this thing in hand in your parishes; and you might have done it, not only without putting members to a single penny of cost, but in a way which would make the working men feel that they were not being patronised in a fashion they did not care for. The next thing we have to consider is, what is the possible rate of interest our money makes. Now, I find it is unsafe to go beyond 3½ per cent. A great many of these societies never think of this at all, and this is shown, perhaps, by a case that came before the Westminster county court, in which a person, after paying into a friendly society for thirty years without receiving a penny out, went to make a demand, and found that the books were closed because the fund was overdrawn. Now, if thirty years ago a better arrangement had been made, by which the demands could be properly met, the widow of the man who was a member of the society for so long a time would not have come to the county court to ask for that which the society ought to have given. Is it possible to find a society formed upon a basis such as that mentioned by the Rev. Mr. Blackley? I very much doubt it; but a society like the one thus sketched you can find. The Church of England Temperance Society took up this matter without any feeling of antagonism whatever to existing societies, and it aimed at giving the working man, free from the influences of the public-house, a means of helping himself. We have had keen competition, but I am glad to say that to-day our friendly society numbers nearly 700 members. Although we have been in existence only a period of five years, our funds average an amount per member which some societies after thirty years' working do not possess. Unlike the Independent Order of Rechabites, which is a very good society, we take both classes of lives. Every member of the Church of England Temperance Society can find a table and rate suitable to him. The Rechabites began thirty-seven years ago, and they have enrolled 75,000 adult members and 25,000 juveniles, and they have a fund of over £300,000. I have no interest whatever in mentioning this society, but this I must say with regard to it, that they have hundreds of working men among their numbers who have been saved from the public-house. They give first-class help, and there is not a single case on record where the county court has been called upon to enforce one single claim. I would, however, point out that the Church of England Temperance Society provides, not only for the total abstainer, but for the temperate man also. If a person signs as a total abstainer, he is entitled to certain benefits; but if he fails in his total abstinence pledge he does not forfeit his payments, as a person would in the Order of Rechabites. In such a case he would be transferred from the total abstinence section to the temperance section. In conclusion, I shall be glad to give any information with reference to our society, and to send papers to anyone who may apply for them.

PAPER.

The Rev. EDWARD STURGES, M.A., Rector of Wokingham.

THERE are many questions of interest connected with Almsgiving, but the present discussion, it must be borne in mind, is confined to those only which connect it with Pauperism and Thrift.

Pauperism is the condition of dependence upon the community for the means of subsistence. But it is not merely *indigence.* Simple helplessness deserves and excites the compassion and respect due to all suffering. There is, however, an underlying meaning of degradation, and even of wrongdoing in the word "pauper," which makes it a term of reproach.

It is a proper function of almsgiving to remove this reproach, and to restore to poverty the gentle and respectful consideration which is due to it from the Christian community. The published returns supply the means of estimating the extent to which pauperism exists in this country. During the year ending Lady Day, 1882, £8,232,472 was spent in England, through the poor-rate, in relief of the poor. On the single day, January 1st, 1882, 803,381 persons were relieved—of these a great army of no less than 106,280 persons were able-bodied, *i.e.*, in full possession of health and strength. The Metropolitan Union of Bethnal Green, with a population of 127,006, relieved, on the single day for which the return is made, 3,319 persons, of whom 1,023 were able-bodied. The three civil parishes of the thriving borough of Reading, with a population of 43,485, relieved 1,129, of whom 544 were able-bodied, and the country union of Wokingham, population 20,015, relieved 646, 224 of them able-bodied.*

Thus destitution appears to be spread almost uniformly over the industrial towns, the country districts, and the most densely crowded parts of the great cities. So far as difference is shown by these specimen cases, destitution of able-bodied persons is greatest where we should expect it to be least, and least where we should expect it to be greatest. In the three unions referred to, it is greatest in Reading, where work and private benevolence abound; and least in Bethnal Green,† where the poor are crowded together very much out of reach of friendly help. A large addition must be made to these figures in order to arrive at the number of different persons relieved during a longer period than one day. It has been said that nearly one in ten of the population are paupers some part of the year.‡

This may be beyond the truth, but it is no exaggeration to say that one person in every ten of the people of England receives the pauper's pay at some time or other during his life. Add to all this the hardship and discouragement inflicted on the most needy of the ratepayers, who, whatever their own struggles for subsistence, must pay the periodic contribution for the support of neighbours, often differing from themselves chiefly in being less thrifty or less industrious. And add, further, the mental anxiety of others, who have such a dread of the badge of pauperism, that they will endure the utmost privations, and sometimes even choose to die rather than seek relief by recourse to the Relieving Officer, and the material is nearly complete which will enable the mind to realise, in some sort, the vast amount of suffering which destitution, and the official way of dealing with it, inflict on the poorer classes of this country.

---

* Returns ordered by House of Commons to be printed 7th March, 1882.

† The destitution of able-bodied persons was, on January 1st, 1882, one in eighty-three of the population in Reading; one in eighty-eight in Wokingham; one in 124 in Bethnal Green.

‡ *English Want and Waste.* By W. L. Blackley. Chap. xi.

But there are other evils besides physical suffering which belong to the destitution, of which pauperism is the outward expression.

The poor-rate expenditure is, at first sight, a national almsgiving of noble proportions. It fails, however, to preserve that character on a closer inspection. Unlike that mercy that "blesseth him that gives and him that takes," it excites neither kind feelings in the giver, nor gratitude in the receiver. No tax is paid more unwillingly. It contracts the ratepayer out of the work and worry of his duty towards his neighbour, and dries up his personal sympathy with distress. But it has not the first condition of a moral act—it is not spontaneous. It is raised, not by an appeal to charitable feelings, but by compulsion; and compulsion which is unequal and needlessly irritating in its incidence. For the fund is assessed, not on the incomes of the wealthy. One kind of property is made to bear the whole burden of it, and from that it is collected in such a manner that the bulk of the fund is finally subtracted from the wages of industry.

The Poor Law offers no encouragement to merit, for, strictly, it can take no account of character. It makes no enquiries, but such as are necessary to show whether or not the applicant is destitute.

The great protection against destitution is *thrift*—that forethought and self-control which lead a man to lay aside what he can spare out of one day's earnings to meet the deficiency of another. The Poor Law system gives no assistance in this, but, on the contrary, is a *direct discouragement to thrifty habits.* It cannot form them because it takes no notice of the poor until they are destitute, and leaves them directly destitution has passed away. The one title to its help is to possess nothing. If a man has saved a few pounds, he must get rid of them, under pain of a criminal prosecution, before he applies to the Relieving Officer. The qualification is that there should be no savings. And the public-house always at hand gives the working man a continual inducement to keep this qualification good.

A worse evil remains behind. It is *the moral degradation of dependence.* There is something so sacred in the natural freedom which enables a man to think and act for himself, and to put the mark of his own individuality on his life, that to withdraw that liberty in the name of charity, or any other, from one who has health and sense to use it, or to acquiesce in its surrender in return for a material gift, is to do an infinite wrong.

It is the very sting of pauperism that it inflicts this wrong. The Poor Law sets a public mark of dependence upon those whom it relieves. It publishes their names, and fixes the limits of their residence; it chooses their doctor in sickness; the very bread they eat is provided, without leaving liberty to select its kind or quality, by the Poor Law officer. This dependence culminates in the workhouse. There the recipients of national relief are mingled together with little regard to age, with none at all to previous history, character, or the cause of destitution, the key is turned upon them, and they are drilled into conformity to one unbending rule of life. "The workhouse," says a recent writer, "which is in its conception half-penal, half-charitable, is, in its results, wholly demoralising."*

---

* *Social Wreckage.* Francis Peak. London.

Nor is the system the necessary consequence of modern civilisation. It is a surprise to find that there is no country in Europe, probably none in the world, except England, which taxes its people for the systematic and exclusive relief of the poor.

To displace this by a higher method of relief, to give a helping hand in some more welcome and effectual way to the millions of our fellow-countrymen, who are directly or indirectly injured by pauperism, is certainly a proper object of Christian ambition.

When allowance has been made for the friendless—sick, and the helpless in mind and body, who are the proper objects of a generous expenditure and a lavish attention, there will remain a vast amount of *temporary destitution* which is *curable*, and of *threatened destitution* which is *preventible*. To deal with these without destroying the independence, the self-respect, the self-reliance of the recipients, to give them help which they may receive without shame, and which will tend to their moral and social advancement, this is a sphere of almsgiving in which success means nothing less than national regeneration, and in which the Church may well aspire to lead the way.

Nor is the task hopeless. There are indications that pauperism is on the wane, and that the time has come for an organised attack on its stronghold. In this county of Berks., for instance, pauperism, which stood at one in sixteen of the population in 1871, fell to one in thirty-three in 1881. A similar improvement has passed over the whole country.

The improvement is partly due to the more stringent application of the workhouse test, but, chiefly, to the increased thrift and forethought of the people, notwithstanding the existing discouragements. The change in this direction is shown by the facts that the deposits in the Savings Banks increased during these ten years at the rate of two millions per annum, and that there was a large addition made to the number of members and the annual income of the friendly societies.

Nor has the limit of the saving power of the people yet been reached. The philanthropist cannot but look with a jealous eye upon the £120,000,000 which finds its way annually into the publican's till and the brewer's pocket, largely from the earnings of industry. After making the fullest allowance for what may be thought a reasonable disbursement for social recreation, the remainder, which is the wasted part of this expenditure on strong drink, would provide for the working classes, ten times over, all that they now receive through the poor-rate. That portion of the drink expenditure which is now employed in *producing* destitution, if diverted to the purpose of *preventing* it, would alone make the pauper's pay and the pauper's loaf the *rare*, instead of the *common*, lot of the English working man.

What steps, then, can be taken for delivering the country from the special shame of English pauperism, and the unnecessary burden of a vast amount of preventible destitution?

It is evident that the present system of rate-relief cannot be suddenly discarded. Bad as it is, it would be much worse to hand over the relief of the poor to an emotional, uninformed private charity. The true principles of efficacious almsgiving must be first understood and acted upon by the private benefactor, and then, and not before, the present official system will be modified or superseded.

It is necessary, in the first instance, to get rid of the prevailing notion that the annual subscription, or the weekly offering at Church, is the beginning and the end of almsgiving. No money-payment whatever can satisfy the claim for consideration which the necessitous have upon the prosperous.

Of what value would the parable of the Good Samaritan be, as an example of perfect almsgiving, if it were reduced to the statement that the Good Samaritan left two denarii with the innkeeper for the use of anyone who might happen to fall into trouble on the Jericho road? The money-aid had its use. It was necessary for the complete relief of the wounded man. But the great lesson of the parable is in the tender sympathy, the time, and skill, and labour bestowed on the traveller; and in the sustained personal attention which did not leave the disabled man until his natural powers of self-help were restored, and he was able to go his own way in his own strength. Four requisites of almsgiving, for the relief of destitution, may be gathered directly from the parable. First, *a personal solicitude for the distressed.* Secondly, *individual treatment.* Thirdly, *the skilled application of remedies;* and fourthly, *adequate* (*i.e.*, not excessive, but fully sufficient to effect a radical cure where such is possible) *adequate relief.**

The only hope for the permanent extinction of the shame and burden of pauperism is in the general acceptance of these four fundamental principles of Christian almsgiving.

The Poor Law system can be set aside in one way only, viz., by the charitable undertaking to relieve destitution by organised, skilled and voluntary efforts. All must be workers, as well as givers, if not personally, at least by a well-chosen agent. The barrier which rate-relief puts between the charitable and the poor would then be broken down, and a true almsgiving reach out a friendly hand to every case of distress, give it a separate attention and suitable treatment, without humiliating the recipient, or encouraging the idle and unthrifty, and the result would be that the Poor Law, which deals with destitution wholesale, by rule of thumb, and doctors up the symptoms without touching the disease, the outcome of all which is pauperism, would find its field of operation greatly reduced.

An "Association of Charitable Workers" would be needed to direct and organise individual efforts. The district of such an association should be large enough to be independent of local prejudice, and small enough to avail itself of local knowledge, interest, and friendship. The county division would answer these conditions. The association would have an agency in every parish of the county. It would receive contributions in money, and the subscribers would be a committee of vigilance over its operations. But its principal objects would be to call forth a body of workers, and train them in skilled methods of almsgiving, and to organise those plans of relief which require combined work or division of labour. Every application for assistance would be remitted to its locality for enquiry, and then *efficiently* and *sufficiently* relieved. The Central Council would correspond and co-operate, as the individual almsgiver cannot, with the Boards of Guardians for the

* Much useful information, on the art of almsgiving, will be found in *Method i Almsgiving.* By M. W. Moggridge. Murray, London.

purpose of restoring, when possible, those overtaken or threatened by destitution to a self-supporting condition.

The London Charities' Organisation Society has practically shown how such an association may be worked, and in several Poor Law Unions of London it has brought into partnership the Poor Law officer and voluntary almsgiving with successful results.*

This organised, active almsgiving would very soon make it possible to extinguish, without hardship or cruelty, the whole system of out-door relief, a step absolutely necessary before pauperism can be brought within measurable distance of extinction. The law of parochial settlement, which has too long nursed the selfishness of the ratepayer and tyrannised over the poor, would then cease, and everyone in the land who desired to change his abode on account of health, or in order to find employment or that he might share a home with a friend or relative, would be at liberty to go up and down the country without let or hindrance. The Government would take the workhouses and invite in the management of them the voluntary assistance of the charitable. The aged would be put into one, the sick into another, young women into a third, friendless orphans trained for domestic or public service, in others ; and the taint of pauperism would be found in none, except, perhaps, in those set aside for the reception of persons destititue through their own persistent misconduct.†

Endowed Charities have had an influence on pauperism only second to that of the poor-rate. In an endowment, the dead and the living enter into a partnership of almsgiving. The dead man charges his estate with an alms, the living agency supplies what the dead cannot, personal sympathy, investigation, discrimination, the skill necessary to mete out the alms in adequate relief, and the power to make such changes in the form of the gift, as the constant change in men and things necessitates.‡

All authorities agree that dole charities are in the present day entirely mischievous. "They create more pauperism than they cure." "The extension of doles is simply the extension of mischief." For "every pauper that doles prevent, they create three."

This is the sentence passed upon them by the official commissioner, the social economist, and the practical philanthropist.

Parliament, acting on this concurrent testimony, has already given to the Charity Commissioners power to deal with such dole charities as are of less value than £50 per annum. This limit should be removed. For if such a power can be properly given, and is found useful in the

---

* *How to help Cases of Distress.* Lock (Longmans.)

† The poor-houses on the Continent of Europe are supported chiefly by voluntary contributions. At Genoa, for instance, there is a handsome building of the kind. The doors are open all day, and seats are placed outside, and along the roads in its vicinity, for the convenience of infirm inmates. At another Italian town, during the writer's residence there, a bazaar was held by the ladies of the place, for the purpose of adding something in the way of furniture and clothing to the comforts of the old people of the poor-house. Would that such a spirit of kindness might light up the dismal rooms of our own workhouses.

‡ See the whole question of the relation of Endowments to the Almsgiving of th Living, discussed in *The Dead Hand*, by the Right Hon. Sir Arthur Hobhouse, Q.C.

Much interesting information will be found in *Endowed Charities*. C. S. Kenny. —London.

distribution of small sums, no reason can be assigned for exempting large ones from a like control.

The scheme recommended by the Commissioners for the employment of the funds thus set free, includes, besides assistance to the sick, the support of provident and friendly societies, contributions towards starting persons in trade, additions to savings made by personal exertions for the purchase of annuities; and discriminating relief by way of loan or otherwise, in cases of unexpected loss, urgent distress, or sudden destitution.

To this it would be well to add power to the trustees to spend capital in providing suitable houses for the poor. The conscience of the country has been awakened to the duty of providing better dwellings for the industrial classes. Why should not these dole-endowments, which are at present a dead drag on charitable work, and tax the ingenuity to know how to get rid of them without doing mischief, be used for the encouragement of this excellent movement? The houses provided should not be rent free. A gift of rent would be as much a dole as a gift of bread or clothing. The charitable expenditure would be the portion of the fund exhausted, after a reasonable rent had been received, in giving a taste for a bright, cheerful, and healthy home.

The Charity Commissioners' scheme, when adopted, does not take the endowments away from the management of local administrators. These might obtain valuable assistance in the use of their enlarged powers of doing good from the County association, if such existed.

And thus private benevolence, the official distribution of relief from public funds, and the administration of endowments working together, though the poor would always remain in the land, that degraded form of poverty which we call pauperism, would become comparatively uncommon, and might in time altogether die out, and the almsgiving of the country rise nearer to the Divine type of it.

"He taketh up the simple out of the dust, and lifteth the poor out of the mire: that He may set him with the princes, even with the princes of His people."—*Psalm* cxiii. 6, 7.

ADDRESS.

Wyndham S. Portal, Esq.

If each of us in our generation had done our best to put an end to or discourage, as far as possible, insolvent and unsatisfactory friendly societies, we should have far fewer pauper children to talk about this afternoon; and if Mr. Blackley's scheme—to which I think the Congress heartily wishes success—of universal insurance were adopted, the number of pauper children would have been so small as to have rendered it quite unnecessary for us to discuss the subject. But the matter, as it stands before us, is vastly different. I wish to make just one remark in passing upon the 30,000 children—who have been called, in Poor Law parlance, Travelling Children—who frequent the casual wards, or live in caravans and gipsy tents. Do you not think that the time has very nearly or quite arrived when some restraint should be put upon their erratic movements, and when these children should produce some testimony to show that which the nation says ought to be done, viz., that they have attended some

elementary school for a certain period, and that they hold a certificate of having passed some Standard. They are at the present moment outside all educational and sanitary laws, and it is difficult for any Church or anybody to get hold of them. I now pass on to out-door relief, and to speak of those whom churchpeople have a chance of reaching. I only wish to make one remark here, and it is with reference to schools. If that remark does not receive your approbation, I am certain it will that of the children in the elementary schools. We have constantly made additions to the convenience, comforts, and necessities of the inside of our schools, while we have made our recreation grounds smaller and smaller every year. I do not think we have taken the powers which the Public Health Act of 1875 has given us, of providing ample and large recreation grounds, one for girls and another for boys, where they can have good physical recreation, instead of amusing themselves in the streets by making mud pies in the gutter, and playing "hop-scotch" on the pavement. Now I come to a most important point; and whatever levity has been shown hitherto, none can be exhibited with regard to the subject of the children who frequent our workhouses. And may I first tell you who they are? They are orphans, without father or mother; perhaps with father or mother in prison; or children who have been deserted, or illegitimate, diseased, deformed, and perhaps what is worse than all, utterly and entirely friendless, with the exception of the master and matron of their establishment, and the kind teachers who teach them. And here I would stay one moment, to remark how deeply the children are indebted to those who have the rule over them, and who, for the most part, show them so much kindness and sympathy. Now it is absolutely necessary that we should do something more for them than we have done up to the present time. With respect to the provision made by the State for these poor children, nothing can be more liberal. The State has made the pauper children a field for educational experiment. We have nine or ten systems under which we have the power of rearing them. We have the ordinary workhouse, with its school, or we may send them to the nearest elementary school to be trained. We may form a separate school, or we may have two or three Union Workhouses to form one school, such as the Reading and Wakenham District School. Next we have the Cottage Home—the cluster of cottages, with the school in the centre, and with a father and mother to every 20 or thirty children. Here I must not forget to mention the State's liberality, which is so great, that when the regular Mother is ill, they provide that which is not provided for you and me—they find them an "extra" mother! We have also the boarding-out system; the training ships, where are made manly boys and manly sailors; and we have such movements as those conducted by Miss Rye and other ladies, by which we may send the children to begin life "over the water." In all we have about ten systems under which these poor children may be trained. One word of advice may I venture to offer, and it is this, that whatever system you find in your neighbourhood, do not try and change it because you think some other is better, but work that which you have, thoroughly and efficiently. They are all good in their way, so far as they are well administered; "the best administered is best." I hope you will believe with me, that there is not one of them actually bad. But we want for all of them one great thing, and that is your sympathy for these poor children. We have many agencies at work, it is true, but the harvest is plenteous, and the labourers are few. We have many ladies labouring in the good work; but we want for the workhouses what John Howard and Mrs. Fry were for the prisons—we want them by the hundreds and thousands. Is it too much to ask that each pauper child should have one friend in the world? There was a story told, a few days ago, of a poor penitent girl on her death-bed, who had fallen. "Can you tell me," she was asked, "how you came

to fall?" "Yes, I think I can tell you," she replied; "I think it was because I had not a friend in the world—no one to speak to me." The time spent at this Congress on this subject will not have been lost if it results in one friend coming forward to father or mother a pauper child—one friend to counsel it or visit it. Thank God we have a "Girls' Friendly Society," and a Mrs. Townsend; and a "Young Men's Friendly Society," and a Canon Shuttleworth. What we want now is that you should each put your shoulder to the wheel, and come forward and help. Some may reply to me and say, "You have the chaplain in the workhouse." Yes, but I would have you remember that you also have your parson in the parish. These chaplains of workhouses are often underpaid and overworked; and there are cases in which weeks, and even months, have elapsed after a vacancy has been created before any nomination has been made. I would urge upon you to systematically visit our workhouses. I know some workhouses in which lady visitors are not allowed, and others where they are not allowed unless accompanied by an official. This should not be. Next, I should like to see the area of our workhouses so enlarged that the boundary should be the seas that gird our island; and I should like to see the workhouses more under Government supervision and control, and become a national instead of a local charge. We might then have one establishment entirely for boys, another for girls, another for infants, and so on. These children are heavily handicapped and weighted; but I should like to see the education made the same inside as outside the workhouse walls, and under the supervision of the Education Department instead of the Local Government Board. And one word more. The Diocesan Inspectors in some dioceses are apt to forget these poor children when they go by the workhouses. They examine the children in other schools, but somehow or other they pass on the other side when they get to the workhouse. I assure you these friendless and destitute children would welcome one fresh face, as would also the master and the teachers. And lastly, one more practical suggestion. Why should not the chaplain of each workhouse make a return of the number of these friendless children to his bishop, at stated periods? Let us all know, let the Church know, the number of these desolate and deserted children; and as I sit down I ask you—Will you come and help them?

DISCUSSION.

The Right Rev. the CHAIRMAN.

I HOPE you will allow me to thank Mr. Portal for his excellent lay sermon; a very admirable example to some of us parsons.

The Rev. E. A. SALMON, Prebendary of Wells, and Vicar of Martock, Somerset.

I THINK if ladies were to interest themselves a great deal more in our friendly societies, they might do much more good among the wives and daughters of our people. In 1879 there were some very able papers read in our Diocesan Conference on this subject, and the result was the formation of a committee, in which several well-known laymen took a great part. Our duty was to examine every club in the country, and to go far and wide throughout England, and to get as many

balance sheets and rules of clubs as we could and examine them. We worked very hard, and we had before us more than 200 balance sheets and sets of rules. We also had part information concerning more than double that number of clubs. We found one, or more, of two kinds of clubs established in almost every parish; one kind terminating in five, seven, or ten years, and the other a permanent club. As to the breaking clubs, we gave our opinion most decidedly, that it would be far better to advise people to enter medical clubs and Government Savings Banks than to have anything to do with them. As to permanent clubs, we examined them carefully, and tried them by four tests; their soundness, fairness, economical management, and the test as to checks on "malingering." I will only give you one instance. Many hard things were said about a great many of my brethren, because they would not favour a club which was very popular in the West of England. That club was rapidly going to the bad. Its liabilities at the end of last year amounted to £438,285, and its assets to £244,831, leaving a deficiency of £193,454. I think the clergy showed their wisdom in having nothing to do with such a club. And then we examined the balance sheets and rules as to their fairness between man and man. We found that very few provided for the differences of age, health, and occupation, or had anything like enough rates to make them fair as between man and man. Then some of the best of the clubs were most exclusive, or most wasteful in their management, and some of the very best produced no adequate checks against playing the "old soldier," and "malingering." A club in Hampshire contains 8,700 members. It is a perfectly sound and good club; but it was considered desirable a few years ago to divide it into two sections—a mutual insurance section and a deposit branch. In the mutual insurance section the average sickness throughout the year was eight days and twenty-one hours; and in the deposit branch it was three days and six hours. This shows the great advantage of the deposit system over the mutual insurance, because in the deposit system it is to the interest of a man to keep off his club, and not in slack times, or when he has an ache or a pain, to go to it for relief. After the most careful consideration, we came to the conclusion that the deposit system was by far the best, and we took as our model a club established by Mr. Best at Abbots Anne, in Hampshire. During fifty years, not one single member of that club had ever come on the parish for relief. But we had another little instance in our own neighbourhood, for we started an experimental club in an agricultural population of 300. In ten years the club obtained a balance of £500 to its credit, and 68 members, and some of the members have already paid in upon the deposit system enough to provide for the rest of their lives for sickness, medical attendance, and old age pay, besides a balance to leave to their families; and this entirely from the interest and compound interest upon their deposits. We have therefore no hesitation in saying that the deposit system is the best to go upon, and I shall be happy to supply our report in which we recommend its adoption. Taking into account soundness, fairness, economy of management, and "malingering;" and taking the Abbot's Anne system, and our own experience, we worked together to avoid all the drawbacks, and make our new club, if possible, as perfect a club as could be made. We had, I may say, a committee of very able laymen to help us, with a great deal of legal assistance, and after drawing up rules we had the club registered by the Treasury as a specially authorised club. I shall be glad to forward the rules of this new club to anyone who may wish to have them, and they may be adopted by any parish or district by simply altering the name of the club, and paying a guinea fee to the registrar. Now, why do I prefer our system to the other two systems? It is better than the Rechabites' Club, though that is in some respects a very good one, because the deposit club helps a man in hard times who would fall out of his club generally upon the other system. 25,000 Odd Fellows are said to have fallen out in one year. Then, I think, it is better than the Church of England Temperance Society, good as that is in some respects, although I strongly object to its system of death allowances, because it provides more checks against "malingering" or "playing the old soldier." My advice to those who have clubs in their parishes is this, if they are "breaking" clubs, try to gradually slip out of them; and I do hope and trust that the laity and clergy throughout the country will try to establish a club on the deposit system in every parish. We ought to be most careful in recommending clubs, and I commend to your thoughtful consideration the one instance which I have mentioned, in which we were all said to be wrong, and all proved to be right.

The Rev. W. S. Carter, B.A., Curate of St. Paul's, Paddington.

Although I have attended other Congresses, this is the first occasion on which I have ever ventured to speak, and, as I am a young man, I hope I may ask your kind indulgence. Indeed, knowing as I do, how much shorter my experience has been than that of most of my reverend brethren present, I should not have ventured to intrude upon your time at all, had it not been for the fact that in my present curacy I have the advantage of having come under the operation of a rather curious, and, as I venture to think, remarkably good scheme for a Parochial Relief Committee. I trust, therefore, that this meeting will grant me its indulgence for a few minutes, and I will endeavour to indicate the main outlines of the scheme, which is all I can do in the short time allotted to me, and, if any one should then care for information as to the details, I shall be happy to furnish them privately. First, then, a printed form, stating full particulars as to name, address, time of residence, ages, children, earnings, and other means of subsistence is filled up by the clergyman, district visitor, or other person interested in the case, and forwarded to the Parochial Mission Room, where we sit every Tuesday, at ten o'clock, to consider the applications. The vicar and myself are assisted on this committee by several ladies, who are not district visitors, the Churchwardens, and two Officers of great experience. And, in order to prevent relief overlapping, we are in communication with the Charity Organisation Society, and the Board of Guardians. The relief granted consists either of money, ordinary tickets of relief, letters for homes and hospitals—the expenses to or from which we often pay or lend—or orders for work, or surgical appliances, and for wine or spirits on a doctor's certificate only. I may mention here, that for one year this rule was waived in cases attended by the parish doctor, as it was alleged that he refused to sign them, and the wine bill amounted to over £14 for the year. Good reason, however, led to the re-inforcement of the rule, and last year the wine merchant's bill only came to 16s. When the case comes before the committee, the first consideration is the report of the district visitors as to the applicant's character. If this is unsatisfactory, the case is usually dismissed at once, as we think, under ordinary circumstances, that they have the best means of knowing the real state of the case. But, if they deem it deserving, the clergy then visit and supplement this information; but the committee invariably grant relief in the meantime, thus differing from the methods pursued by the Charity Organisation Society. The cases are then divided into two classes—(1) those which only require a little relief through a present illness or difficulty; and (2) those which seem chronic, and require relief of a more permanent kind. In the latter case, we give pensions in the shape of small weekly allowances, or other relief, to those whose earnings, although insufficient themselves to maintain the applicant, are, nevertheless, enough to make up a sufficient income when supplemented by our grant. But one *sine quâ non* of this relief is, that the applicant shall have resided at least two years in the parish; and the practical result has been that in many instances, children, or other relations, who had previously given little or no assistance to their parents, have been led to co-operate with us to keep them from becoming a burden upon the rates. The other cases of temporary relief chiefly arise from sickness. I have already indicated the manner in which these are relieved, but, I should mention that, so as to encourage thrift, we do not, as a rule, relieve cases arising solely from slackness of trade, unless there are exceptional circumstances, as we consider that a man should provide for these known and to-be-forseen contingencies, by joining a club, or laying by money in some savings bank. But this is not an absolute rule, though it has great influence in inducing us to relieve the case, if the applicant can show that he has been provident when he had the opportunity. We do not make any grants towards the payment of any debts due to tradesmen or others, nor yet for funeral expenses; considering that such assistance scarcely can be said to come under the head of "personal relief," of which we wish as far as possible to make our almsgiving consist. I must not take up your time by entering further into details of our work; but, I hope I have said something to indicate a manner in which others may exercise a little more thought and discrimination than before in their almsgiving. Although at first we may think, as I once thought, that organisation sometimes causes loss to persons deserving of charity, because the old motto, "*Bis dat qui cito dat*," is thereby so often violated; yet I am sure that in the end we shall be forced to acknowledge that indiscriminate almsgiving is no true charity, and that to bestow alms merely to relieve oneself from an importunate beggar, is not really benevolence, but selfishness. As the Rev E. Sturges said just now, no money payment whatever can satisfy the claims of conscience in this

matter, for if we are really earnest workers in the cause of charity—if, that is, we have the true spirit of Christian almsgiving; if we sincerely care for the welfare of our poorer brethren—and God knows, and in most cases the poor man knows, too, that there is no truer friend to the labouring man than the parochial clergyman;—and, if we set God's glory, and the advancement of His Kingdom before us in this and all our actions, we shall not mind the extra toil and trouble which such a system as I have indicated undoubtedly causes. Rather shall we be glad if, at any cost of time or exertion, we can thus more effectually succour some poorer brethren, and, by giving more encouragement to self-reliance, and developing resources of self-help, aid the spread of thrift, and reduce the number of those who now virtually live upon misdirected, although, no doubt, kindly-meant, almsgiving. And although it must be long before poverty can even be appreciably diminished, our small efforts after a wise and thoughtful almsgiving will have some effect, however small, in bringing about that result; and Almighty God will behold and bless our attempts, and reward this our work for His poor in the day of His appearing, and His Kingdom.

Rev. HENRY OVERY, St. Veep, Lostwithiel, Cornwall.

I HAVE taken much interest in pauper children, and I hope in the future to continue to do so. I can conceive nothing worse than the ordinary surroundings of the education of the workhouse child. We have been told whence our pauperism comes. I think I may say there are two sources which always supply the stream—laziness and vice. From these two sources you have supplied to you a number of children, nourished on pauper milk, nursed in pauper arms, and surrounded by pauper influence. They are found in establishments where everything is pauperism, from the day of their birth to the day of their departure. From its mother's arms till it leaves the workhouse, the pauper child knows nothing but the dull dreary routine of the workhouse. Well, what I desire first of all is, that the poor child shall be removed from the *contaminating influence of the pauper education system*. Everyone may not understand exactly how the education is provided in the workhouse system. I will briefly describe it; for very much room exists for improvement in that system. The Local Government Board has the power of appointing and dismissing the teacher, while with the Education Department lies the power of giving the "grant," on which chiefly depends the means of instructing the children. But on what basis is the grant given? On the same basis as in other schools? No. The workhouse children are neither encouraged by the grant given, nor depressed by its refusal. It is not reckoned on the efficiency of the children, but on the efficiency of the master, who receives the grant according as his examination certificate is first, second, or third class. There is really no stimulus to make the children what they should be. What shall we say to a mechanical system like this for children, who, like the late Dr. Kitto, may not be personally responsible for their presence in the workhouse? Should we like our descendants to be debarred from communication with the outer world? I think it is incumbent upon each one of us to do what we can to remove the children, at least for educational purposes, from the area of the workhouse, and to send them outside to *Parish or to Board schools*. Let them feel that their own independence may make it impossible for them to return to the workhouse which they have left. In nine cases out of ten they come back. And why? They come back because their lives have been badly influenced, dulled, and chilled by that hard mechanical workhouse system. They come back to the bad influences of their early home, because those influences are engrained in their character. Already there are 142 unions in which the children are educated in Board and other schools outside the workhouse. Let us increase their number. Then there is another system within the bounds of practicability. It, too, has been successfully tried in a large number of unions. It is *the Boarding Out System*. The children are placed under the care of those who take the entire charge of them, and who are, in fact, their guardians. It seems that for those who love the workhouse child, and wish to do him good, there is here an opportunity for caring for his moral and spiritual strength, as well as his physical and mental development. If you find an aged couple willing to take a child into their house, to care for it, and to provide it with board and lodging at the cost of the union, is it not one of the duties of our common humanity to see that the child should be given to them, and so find a home, for the child's sake, for the sake of the Church,

and for His sake who said, "In heaven, the angels do always behold the face of my Father." I am not, from lack of time, able to speak of other details; but I wish to press upon all here, that by their influence, by their personal visits to workhouses, by practical sympathy, they should do all in their power to remove children from the evil influences of the workhouse, and from its evil results.

Rev. J. Hasloch Potter, Vicar of Holy Trinity, Upper Tooting.

I have only risen to put very briefly before the meeting one or two of the manifest advantages of the plan described by Mr. Carter. I believe that the same lady who inaugurated the plan in his parish also inaugurated it in mine. The first advantage is uniformity of method. It is said that under some systems a person will move out of one district in a parish into another, where it is known more relief is given, but nothing of that kind can take place in the working of Mr. Carter's plan. Another advantage is investigation. It is impossible, in nine cases out of ten, for a district visitor to investigate thoroughly. But thorough investigation will lead into many channels, and will indirectly promote thrift and providence. Another advantage is that adequacy of relief is afforded. Of what use is eighteenpence a week in groceries, to a sick man with a wife and family? What we want to do is to work at the root of the mischief; and I believe that where the individual district visitor or parish priest is utterly powerless, a committee can step in and provide adequate relief. We have, therefore, sketched out to us in this system unity of plan, thorough investigation, and adequacy of relief. One great result we secure is, that we foster prudence and discourage indiscriminate begging, while, on the other hand, we provide means for really necessitous cases. Then we gain the confidence of our parishioners. A parishioner of mine came to me the other day, and said, "I will give you £5, but please do not let any of it go to find port wine for the wife of my neighbour's coachman, who is receiving two guineas a week." By a system like this we secure the support of our wealthier neighbours, and show them that their money, which is given for charitable purposes, will not be used to foster improvidence. Further than this, we free the parish priest and the district visitors for the higher functions—the spiritual—of their office. I can assure this meeting that I thankfully accept the assistance of such a committee as this in my parish, as giving me more leisure to minister to the flock the Bread of Life.

H. Wright, Esq.

The Revised MS. of this Speech was not returned in time for insertion here, and appears as Appendix A.

Rev. G. Herbert Woolley, Secretary of the Church of England Central Home for Waifs and Strays.

I desire to say a ew words with regard to pauper children. You have heard very interesting details from Mr. Portal on the subject of district schools; but there was one point left out. I am quite sure that all who have had anything to do with children outside or inside their homes, must have seen how their after character is formed by the personal and direct influence exercised over them while young. Especially is this the case in regard to girls. Now how is that possible, I would ask, in district schools in the case of pauper children? Each child is lost in the mass. It is known sometimes by a number—hardly by any name at all—and it grows up without any personal affection. If it ever had a home at all, its father was only a

name in most instances ; but in the workhouse it loses even that small idea of home. How is a girl, brought up under such circumstances, to know in after life what home is? Never having known what personal affection is, she cannot exercise it. When once in service, if she receives kindness, she cannot understand it, and she consequently doubts every kindness, or thinks it to be weakness, for she does not understand what real affection is. Then the child has never learned the lesson of true home obedience. She has learned obedience in the district school ; but when there is no longer force to compel, she has no power of rendering respectful obedience from a higher motive. However great the evils of pauper schools may be in other respects, the want of the knowledge of real kindness and love is the most fatal. Then I would urge that these big pauper schools are a great evil ; and we who are connected with the Church Society for caring for waifs and strays, are endeavouring to substitute something for pauper orphan girls in the place of those schools. It is well known that there is power to board out children under seven years of age, but it is not so well known that children over that age may be placed in certified schools of any size. We want to use influence to get the Boards of Guardians to place the girls out ; but we are met by the statement that our rates are already heavy, and this will increase them. But the fact is, after the first furnishing, the expenses for a home of thirty children are small if it is carefully managed. We have succeeded in one case in getting 5s. 6d. a week per head for a number of children, and that sum will almost keep the home going, as the Guardians will also provide some clothing. In a home of from twenty to thirty girls, the matron will be able to show a considerable amount of personal attention and affection, while the ladies of the local committee will visit the girls, and watch over them in a kindly spirit, both in the home and when they are placed out. I think this is a great scheme, and a very promising one for the future of the pauper children. We are now trying it on a small scale, and we hope the Church will enable us to try it on a large scale, until the Guardians take up the work themselves—seeing its success. Our Society would gladly go further. Why should these children—many of them—ever have the taint of pauperism cast upon them at all? Many of them are children of widows who are forced into workhouses, because they have so many children dependent upon them that they cannot maintain them. What we are willing and anxious to do in the case of a widow who is a respectable woman, willing to do her utmost to keep out of the workhouse, is to take one or two of her children and provide homes for them, thus giving her a chance of supporting the others. By doing this we are promoting true economy—helping the woman to support herself and her children, and thus keeping her off the rates. If afterwards, by her own fault, she goes on the rates, her children will be sent back to her. We are thus endeavouring to do a great work which is sure to have most beneficial results—an economical work, inasmuch as intelligent children are worth more to the State than dull ones ; good citizens are a profit, while the bad ones cost us millions—a good work, which, while it must appeal to the hearts of all who love children, is sure of a blessing from Him who loves them more than we can ever do.

James Butcher, Esq., Gunnersbury.

I THINK the speech of Mr. Portal must have had a great effect upon all present, and should have been delivered last, so that we might have gone home with it fresh in our minds. There is much necessity for a close application of the principle laid down in the New Commandment of Christ—why it is not put up in churches, together with the Ten, I never could understand—viz., loving our neighbours. Poverty may come upon us at any time, and therefore, as we should desire help and assistance, it is our duty to render help to those in distress. I should not like my dear little children to be in the state in which some of the poor workhouse children, of whom we have heard, have been, and many still are ; and therefore it is the duty of each one of us to let that consideration come in upon us, and to do all we can to lift them out of their present condition, and promote their happiness. I in all sincerity ask you to do something in this matter—I ask you to think of those eloquent words of Mr. Portal's, which I am sure God will bless. If I had my way, I would make every man insure his life before he married. When my daughters grow up, I shall require that their intending husbands prove their *bonâ fides* by assuring their lives. A young man who is married may die twelve hours after he has insured his life, and in that case he leaves £500 for his wife and children. The neglect to make

that provision, to my mind, amounts almost to criminality. Having the £500, what is a woman to do with it? Surely a lump sum of that amount will, when invested, bring in £25 a year. That would be something for a poor woman to depend upon. With a sum like that, she would be able to do a little—if not much—still a little, towards supporting herself and orphan children with it as a certainty. I would make this condition, that if she married again the money should go to her children. And who could be better trustees of such monies than the local clergy? The way I have indicated is, I think, a practical way of dealing with the question. Some people tell us that drink is the cause of all evil. I wish I could think so. To a large extent I believe it is the love of finery, and living beyond our means. To go and preach to poor men and women, and say that they ought to save out of 25s. a week, with perhaps five children to support, is downright nonsense. A man who starves himself, in order to put money into a savings bank, is pursuing a suicidal policy. I trust all present will do all they can to urge men to assure their lives; and if there is a demand for the large companies to accept weekly payments, I feel sure they will meet it.

The Rev. THEOPHILUS BENNETT, Chudleigh, Devon.

I HAVE a special reason for speaking this afternoon, and that is, that I may deliver my speech in a very mild manner. As to pauperism, which still clings to us, it is hard to shake off poverty and to get rid of it, for Lucian represents it as surrounded with little nooks; but we must do all we can to ameliorate the pauperism of the country, and in this way I think prevention is better than cure. You see very few Jew paupers, and why, because they practise prevention. If we did the same, we should have very much less poverty to deal with than we have. I think that Boards of Guardians should recollect that they are Guardians of the poor, and not Guardians of the rates. As a rule, they think much of the rates, and very little of the poor. When I was a guardian of the poor, I endeavoured to be so, and I obtained the honorary title of the the "poor man's friend." Daniel Defoe said, two hundred years ago, that the English people are deficient in husbandry, and they are so still. I think we are the most wasteful people on the face of the globe, and yet the old adage says, "Waste not, want not." Let us attend to this little question, and then let us set an example. We should practise thrift ourselves, and our wives should also practise it. I do not see if we clergy wear a particular garment, why our wives should not also, so that they may be known by their dress as clergywomen, as we are known by our cloth as clergymen. In this way, we should in our little parishes promote economy. Mrs. Booth, I think, was right in dressing her hallelujah lasses in a fashion that will not change. If our clergy wives would do a little more in this direction, we could then do a little more for charity. I have an old clergyman in my parish, who has gone over to the Baptists, but he is able by thrift to keep a school going out of his own savings. It has been said that Dr. Hook became an Oddfellow, and, I am thankful to say, I followed his example, and am one also. I am, in addition to that, a Forester, and a Freemason; and I think it a high honour to be a Freemason. My advice to you is, if you want real pleasure, be your own almoners if you can.

CONGRESS HALL,

WEDNESDAY EVENING, OCTOBER 3RD.

The Right Rev. the PRESIDENT in the Chair.

WORKING MEN'S MEETING.

ADDRESSES.

The Right Rev. the PRESIDENT.

My good friends, what I have to say for myself I am sure I may also say for all who have the management of this Congress; and it is that we are very glad to see you. I think you would have been much surprised if you had not been invited to our meeting, and I am sure we should have been very much disappointed if you had not accepted our invitation when we gave it to you. In the early years of these Church Congresses it was not usual to put out any such invitation as that which has brought you here. That may seem to have been a somewhat unsociable, not to say uncivil, arrangement; but the fact is, it did not strike us so at first. The members of the Church Congress came together for their own business, and it did not occur to them that the great body of the people living in the place where they had met, had anything to do with the matter. But after a short time there came to them another and a truer thought—namely, that when two or three thousand churchmen assembled in a place to deal with church matters, the occasion was one in which all the people of the place, particularly all the Church people of that place, might be expected to feel very deeply interested indeed. And so, as we could not ask the people of the town to come and spend the whole week with us, we were anxious that you should upon one evening hear a few speakers state to you the reasons which had brought them together. You have a right to ask—I do not say me, for I am bound always to be at your service—but you have a right to ask these gentlemen who are in our midst what they have come here for; and they will be very glad to tell you. A considerable portion of the subjects which have already occupied, and which are yet to occupy, our attention are as much your subjects as ours. For instance, there is one that will be discussed to-morrow—namely, the Universities. Perhaps you may think that the Universities have little to do with you; but I have known sons of working men—not a great many, it is true—who have taken honours at the Universities, and who have come out qualified to enter upon any place in the Church or State to which God's providence might call them. And, therefore, I cannot say that you are not interested in the question even of Universities. Besides all that, the Universities are the places at which the future rulers of England are trained, and that is an additional reason why the subject should interest you. This morning we had a

very interesting discussion in your new town hall upon the condition of women in respect to their purity of life, and also in regard, alas! to the degradation to which some of them have been reduced. At that meeting there was a very strong and earnest feeling, expressed very eloquently, that the monstrous evils of impurity, and of the degradation of women, were not only leading them to their own ruin and unhappiness, but were also leading to the unhappiness and degradation of England. That, again, is a subject in which the working classes are every bit as much interested as we are. Are the working man's home, his fireside, his wife, his children, less precious to him than his employer's home, his wife, and children, are to his employer? Not a bit of it. There is the same feeling in the one case as in the other; and if the home of anyone is dishonoured, and wife and children ruined and injured, the calamity is felt by the poor man as much as by the rich. In dealing with this question, it was our desire that the seducer should be made to feel the depths of his villany, and should be brought to a due sense of his shame. It was our earnest wish that something should be done to give a healthy and happy tone to all the relations between man and woman, so that both might become fitting companions to each other in time and in eternity. In the afternoon of the same day we had an equally interesting discussion on the law of marriage. You are no doubt aware that in some countries there has been an unhappy change in that respect. A speaker in the discussion informed us that there are countries in Europe and America where for every seven or eight marriages there is one divorce. That is not the condition of things in England, and we must take care that it never is so. We must take care that neither by change of laws, nor by a change of moral tone, shall the sacred bond of wedlock ever be impaired. Some persons desire to take away the relationship which we hold to exist between a husband's kindred and his wife. As things now stand, a wife's sister is one to whom the husband can look in seasons of emergency and domestic trouble; but they want to do away with all that, and to make changes which assume that the husband is no more to the nearest of his wife's kindred than he is to the strange girl who may happen to pass in the street. I should be very glad to think that they will never succeed, but whether they succeed or not, I come back to the conclusion that the subject is one that equally concerns you. There is one other question to which I wish to refer—I mean the Sunday question. That is a question upon which people have very different opinions. Some want to make Sunday as near as may be like other days, and some are anxious rather to keep it as it has been kept in England for so long, and even to improve its observance. We are, however, all agreed on what I hope you are also agreed—that it is the Lord's Day. God has set His mark upon it as the day on which He rested from the work He had done, and has taken it out of the rest of the week as a day to be kept by His people joyously and happily, in freedom from labour, from riot and disorder; and we wish that the day upon which He has thus set His mark should be the brightest of all days. Whether it is hereafter to be a day of work, or a day of rest, is to you working men a question of vital importance. One word more. We have a great many common interests and duties and feelings, and when we discuss them as Christian men, we are all deeply concerned in the solution to which we

may come. The clergy desire—I hope you will believe what I say—we who stand forward as pastors of the Church, desire, above all things, the truest happiness of all who are here. We desire that working men should throng our churches, not for our own vain-glory, but in order that they may receive the benefit of our ministrations, and because we believe that we can help them while they live, and comfort them when they die. The people of Reading have welcomed us very kindly, and there is a very good feeling generally among the people. I hope that our gathering this evening will not disturb that good feeling, but will help to cement it more closely.

The Lord Bishop of Carlisle.

Your lordship said just now that, although you had a right to be here, those who came from a distance were bound to say what they came for. I think it is a sufficient apology for my coming down from the North of England to say that I came to look at this magnificent meeting. At all events, it is quite sufficient satisfaction for me for all the difficulties of the great journey from Carlisle down to Reading, to have the pleasure of looking upon this vast gathering I see below the platform to-night. Your lordship told the meeting something about the first beginning of these working men's meetings. I think there was a little circumstance connected with the origin of them which is rather interesting, and which I may, perhaps, be allowed to mention. The fact is, that the first beginning of the working men's meetings came from the working men themselves. It was not that the wise men of the Congress thought that they had made a mistake, and that they ought to correct it, as was a little suggested by our chairman. But the fact is that the working men of York found out a little deficiency in the Church Congresses, and they sent in their cards and asked if they might not have a share in what was going on. And I mention this because I am sure that people always like best anything that they choose for themselves. I think the greatest objection to physic is when the doctor says you must take it. If you were to take it of your own accord, you would think it the nicest stuff in the world. Now, with regard to these Church Congresses, I should like to mention a little anecdote which came into my mind as the bishop was speaking. I remember, at a Church Congress at Norwich some years ago, there was a woman sitting at her door, and a person who was passing said to her, "Oh, what's up now; what's all this about the Church Congress which makes the place so full?" And she said, "I believe it's a frolic of the parsons'." Well, in a certain sense, perhaps it may be. But there is something in Church Congresses much deeper than that. I should not have come all the way from the north merely for a frolic. I came from the north to join in this Church Congress, because I believe the Church Congresses may do a great deal of good in a variety of ways. But I am not going to lay stress upon that just now. I am not going into the history of Church Congresses or their special benefits, for we have already heard some very important remarks upon that matter. I have always thought that any one speaking to strangers should know something of the matter in hand, and,

therefore, with your permission, I will give you a little portion of the history of my own life. I went to school not so many miles away from this place when I was a little boy, and that was some 50 years ago. One of my chief pleasures used to be to go into a shop, which I remember exceedingly well—I could go into it blindfolded now—and my great treat was to buy a Reading biscuit. And I can assure you that in those days I thought that that man—whose history has come down to us, and concerning whom, as little children, I believe the only fact we knew was that "he bought a buttered biscuit"—was a very wise man indeed. I mention that because of the very remarkable change which has taken place since then. Fifty years ago Reading biscuits were famous things, in my eyes at least, but I suppose that probably is because, although they were brought over once a week by the carrier, when we went into the shop we were very often told that the supply had not arrived. Things have altered since then. You turn things out by machinery now. If anyone went over that remarkable biscuit factory near here, one would find every kind of machinery for the manufacture of biscuits. In fact, I should not be surprised to see a sack of flour go in at one end of a machine and come out at the other in the shape of biscuits in tin boxes. And now, instead of having the one kind only we used to have, we have got every variety. There are Alberts, Victorias, milk and water, and I know not what. Well, there is another feature in the biscuit trade which perhaps you will allow me as a looker-on to remark upon, and that is they go all over the world. Wherever you travel you are sure to see in every respectable shop of every respectable town the well-known name of Huntley and Palmer. Now there is one thing I should like you to bear in mind. I have not the least doubt in the world that, although this great change has taken place in external circumstances, there is one thing that is the same throughout—I have not the least doubt that the people whom I knew 50 years ago, and the people who stand in their shoes now, agree in the main thing, and that is this, that they use the best materials for the purpose. The principle is the same, although the outside circumstances have changed. That seems to me to be a very important piece of philosophy. And that brings before us this great truth, which I should like to impress upon you, with regard to one particular subject, viz., that stability and progress may very well go together. And I believe the principle of almost everything that is good—the principle of our own lives, the principle of legislation; and the principle which distinguishes great nations and great institutions is the proper combination of stability with progress. Now let me apply that maxim to that which is brought before our minds by these Church Congresses. I should like to point out to you, and I should like to make you believe that this principle of stability combined with progress is that which has characterised, and does characterise, the Church of England. If I look back to the condition of the Church of England to which I referred just now, when I was a boy at school, I see some very remarkable differences in those days as compared with the present. For example, when I go through our country now—whether it be in my own diocese up in the north, or whether in this more sunny—I suppose you call it, although we had a tremendous burst of rain this afternoon—this more sunny diocese of the south—wherever I turn I observe a remarkable change

in the condition of the churches. They are what we call restored, or rebuilt, or repaired. In almost every village now I see the church in such a state as befits the house of God; a very different state from that of fifty years ago. Why, it was the commonest thing in the world to find a church the very dirtiest and most neglected, and least tempting building in the whole of the parish. That has changed; we have made progress in that matter, and not only progress with regard to the external building, but we have made very remarkable progress also in respect of the uses to which we put our churches when we have got them. There are now multiplied services, and I find people taking great interest in them. Notwithstanding all drawbacks and defects, remarkable progress has been made in the character of the services in the churches. And, what is more, I find that our churches are to a great extent free and open—churches to which a poor man can go. At the time of which I speak, things, unfortunately, were very different. You would go into a church, and there you would see a mass of pews, and you could almost tell the place that a man occupied in the parish by measuring the height of his pew. And so remarkable were these structures, that I remember, in the case of a church with which I had to do, that a person came into the church one day when it was full; all the congregation were down upon their knees, and in consequence were not visible, and he went out of the church again thinking there was no one in it. Now I say that we have made some improvements, at all events with regard to these things. God knows there is still great room for improvement. I do not come here to boast—to tell you that the condition of things is perfect; but I do say with all gratitude, from the bottom of my heart, that things have very much changed, and that the Church of England is not now what she was 50 years ago. Again, I find all kinds of new efforts and new institutions. Almost every day there springs up some new society. People are not content with the machinery they have already, but they must have some new machinery from day to day. I am almost alarmed by the number of these new societies and organisations. All this, however, argues remarkable activity, as do the records of these Church Congresses, which would have been impossible 50 years ago. But when I look upon this meeting, I see a proof that God is with us, and that He has blessed us. I spoke just now of your biscuits being all over the world. Is not our Church all over the world? We have upon the platform this evening a brother clergyman—and may God be with him—who is going out to preside over a church in the Antipodes, having occupied a high place in the Church at home. Yes, my dear friends, whether we look at home or abroad, I think there can be no question that a great power is with us—that God's Holy Spirit is with this dear old Church of ours, and that it has made progress, and, God helping us, it shall make yet more progress. And now we come to the other point, and that is stability. Is it a new Church? God forbid. It is the old Church—the Church that came down from our fathers and our forefathers; the Church that existed hundred of years ago; the Church that was only reformed and restored, and not changed into a new one, at the time of our great Reformation. We stand upon the same old foundation—the Word of God. We read and expound that Word now as we have always done. We have the same dear old Prayer Book, and stand upon its principles, and use its prayers, and delight to think that

for centuries and centuries past those same prayers have been used by those who have gone before us. This being the case, I should like to ask you one or two questions. One question is that which was asked in a publication some time ago, viz., "Is the Church of England worth preserving?" I hope if I were to put that to this meeting to-night there would be a unanimous vote in the affirmative. You may depend upon it if you destroy that Church of England you will destroy something most precious, something very difficult to replace; and when it has once gone, you will be very sorry that it has been taken from you. And let me say this—it is not that I want to impress upon you the necessity of all belonging to the Church of England, probably there may be some of you here who would say you did not belong to the Church of England, I am not going to quarrel with you if you do say so—but I say this, whether you belong to the Church of England or not, the Church of England belongs to you. As our Chairman has already said, he is your servant at all times. You may, if you please, repudiate him; you may say you have nothing to do with him, but he cannot say that he has nothing to do with you, because your souls have been entrusted to him by Almighty God.

Is the Church worth preserving? I think you will admit it is. But there is a more practical question. Are you using it as it ought to be used? That is a very important question; and when we talk about using the Church as it ought to be used, I, for one, am not going to throw the blame upon the lay people, that they do not use the Church as fully and as regularly as they might. I have no doubt that there is some blame belonging to us clergy, and we ought not to repudiate it. We do not do our duty as many of us ought; but, at the same time, I know that there is an almost incredible amount of loving, zealous labour expended throughout the country, and there never was a time when the clergy were working more earnestly, in a more God-fearing, and in a more self-denying spirit, for the good of the people, than they are at the present time. But whether this be so or not, what I would say to you good people is this, Recognise that the Church is your Church, recognise that the Church is the poor man's Church, and that every man in the parish has a right to come to the Church, and it is his own fault if he stays away. You may depend upon it that it is a great blessing and privilege to have a Church concerning which you can say this. And, undoubtedly, the more you make use of this privilege the more blessing you will find, and the more thoroughly you will love the Church that God has planted in this land. But there is something else I should like to say, and it is that I cannot help feeling that we are living just now in very difficult times, that there is a change with regard to spiritual things in this country which affects us all. It is not a question of Church or dissent. It is a question which concerns the souls of all men, of whatever class or denomination. What I mean is this—there is an attempt to destroy all kind of belief, all kind of faith in God, and all kind of faith in our Lord Jesus Christ, such as I believe has never been made before the present time. I receive from time to time—I do not know why they are sent to me, but I receive newspapers containing horribly blasphemous pictures, horribly blasphemous sentiments, and assertions which can only have the one effect of paining any Christian man or woman to whom they are

submitted. These are sent to me, and I know they must be sent to others. In fact there is no question that, for some reason or another, an attempt, unequalled by any similar attempt in the history of the world up to the present time, is being made to destroy the Christian faith. I cannot help thinking of what the poet says :—

> Who steals my purse steals trash ;
> 'Twas mine, 'tis his, and has been slave to thousands.
> But he that filches from me my good name
> Robs me of that which nought enriches him,
> And makes me poor indeed.

Let me make one little change in these words of Shakespeare. Who steals my purse steals trash ; but he who takes from me my faith in Christ takes from me that which, in the nature of things, can do him no manner of good, but makes me infinitely, desperately, horribly poor. Now then I say, my dear Christian friends, whether you be churchmen, whether you be dissenters, to whatever body you belong, join together hand in hand, shoulder to shoulder, and foot to foot, to try and knock back this tremendous attack of Atheism. Hold fast your faith in the Lord Jesus Christ. Depend upon it it is no slight or trifling question. It is a question which vitally affects you, which affects your children, which will affect generations still unborn. Hold fast to the faith of the Lord Jesus Christ. Believe that in Him you have such a Friend, such a Redeemer, such a Saviour as you cannot otherwise have. Believe that in throwing Him away you throw from you your dearest and best friend. And do not allow any one, any man, however great his ability, whether pretending to philosophy or to science, to deprive you of that which is the most precious possession of the rich man or the poor man—the most blessed possession of the philosopher and of the peasant. Aye, hold fast to that which you have, and let no man take your crown.

The Right Rev. the PRESIDENT.

THE bishop who has just spoken to you has told you, in his pleasant way, of the journey he had from the far north, but the bishop I am going to introduce to you has only had an hour's ride to come here. I must tell you that he does not come from Bedford, although I have no time to explain why he is called the Bishop of Bedford. He comes from London, where he is doing an excellent work amongst the poorest people in the east end of that vast city. Yet amongst these poor—amongst these, perhaps, the very hardest worked people of London, there are very few who work harder than he does.

The BISHOP OF BEDFORD.

I HAPPENED, a short time ago, in something I said in public, to agree with the Bishop of Manchester. One of the daily papers commented on the fact of the remarkable accord between the bishop of a vast manufacturing city like Manchester, and the bishop of a purely rural diocese

like Bedford. Now newspapers very seldom make mistakes, as you are aware, but on this occasion there was a little mistake, and as it was a very natural mistake, and one I should not be surprised at any of you falling into, should you take the trouble to think about me at all, I may as well tell you that I have nothing in the world to do with Bedford, being simply a sort of curate-Bishop of East London, where I have in my sub-diocese best part of a million of the working classes. I can't bear being called by such a nonsensical title as "Bishop of Bedford," but I didn't choose the title, and I can't help it. Well, one thing I am quite certain of: If the great battle of religion against the world, the flesh, and the devil, is to be fought out at all, it must be fought out in the great battlefields of our big towns, in the midst of the roar and rush of eager thought and earnest action. And if the good old Church of England is either too timid, or too dainty, or too dignified, to throw herself into the forefront of the battle, and to take her full share of the dust and din of the contest, she is scarcely worthy of being the Church of the Nation. Now, I always like to have a talk with the working men in East London when I get a chance. Some people fancy a bishop has got to ordain, and confirm, and consecrate churches, and look after the clergy, and preach sermons, and do a good bit of marrying, and write a heap of letters, and that's about all. Well, that is not quite my idea of my office. I believe I am set where I am to bring the cause of religion and of the Church before all the people; and I don't mean to be content till the working men of East London, and the poor old women in the workhouses, and the little children in the schools, and the rough factory girls, and "all sorts and conditions of men," know me (that is, if God spares me) as *their* bishop. I know it is presumptuous; but it is my ambition; and, what is better, my notion of what a bishop ought to try to be. The best any of us can do is to work a little way towards the ideal we set up of what we ought to be. Let us all have a try at this. I picture to myself what I think a bishop ought to be. And I mean to try to work towards that. Do you picture to yourselves what you think a working man ought to be, and try to work towards that. I have no particular right to draw your picture for you, but I think if I were a working man I should picture a brave, manly, sober, independent, generous fellow, fearing God, and doing to man as he would be done by. And I would try, by the grace of God, to work a little way towards it. Now, you will have seen from what I have said, that I think the Church ought to have a big heart—full of sympathy for all her children. God save her from being the Church of a class or a party! There is nothing more full of danger, morally and socially, than the great—I really hope not now widening—gulf between classes. It is easy enough to see causes for this; not quite so easy to devise remedies. But if there is one thing which ought to build bridges, and bring class to class in more love, and unity, and fellowship, it is the Church of Christ. I am afraid the Church is looked upon too often as the Church of the rich. Perhaps she has given cause for this. Perhaps she has been too respectable, too much given to kid gloves and velvet slippers. The people must feel (if she wants to regain their confidence) that she belongs to them; that they have their right to her services, her ministrations, her fabrics; their right to a free place in her houses of prayer, and their right to take their part in her services, as much as the

greatest and noblest in the land. Again, the Church must be of no political party. I suppose from the mere fact of her historic position, her guardianship of ancient truth, the changelessness of her order and constitution, her bias would be towards conservative principles. Well, I hope we don't want to compose a brand-new creed, or work out a brand-new system of Church government. Why, only think what might become of the bishops! But I am sure, on the other hand, the Church is not rising to the full conception of her mission in the world unless she can sympathise with the newer feelings and modes of thought of these later days, unless she can understand and grapple with the great problems which are seething in men's minds; unless she can adapt herself to new circumstances, and rise to the call of new emergencies. She is not alone the Church of the past, but is also the Church of the present; and if she comes not into contact with the hard facts of daily life, and the hard questions of surging thought, she will soon be left stranded like an old hull on the shore. If it is her duty to stand in the old paths, and maintain the old truths unsullied, and hand down the old traditions of our fathers, it is no less her duty to sympathise with all that is true and pure and good in the aspirations of the people, and to promote everything which can help them in their struggles after better things, both for this life and for the next.

Now, this leads me to say a word or two as to those aspirations and struggles of yours. You men have got to work out your own elevation. No one can do it for you, and it wouldn't be good for you if they could. We don't want you to be held in leading strings, or to be petted and patronised into goodness. You must—it is God's ordering for the growth of His children—you must work out better things for yourselves. Now it does my heart good to see how the working men of England are taking up one cause which can only result in their rising to a higher and nobler life—I mean the Temperance cause. That is the people's own work. The best and truest and bravest of the people have said, "We will be slaves to strong drink no longer. We will be sober, and free. We will wipe out the disgrace which has so long blotted the fair fame of England, and men shall no more point to us and say we are a drunken people." They have said it, and they mean it, and they are doing it. God be thanked. But there are other things you working men have to think about, and grapple with, and work out to their righteous issues. There are labour questions, trade questions, land questions, emigration questions, Church questions, and sanitary questions; I could say a good deal, if I had time, on these matters. And I should like to say something about the combination of working men for Church work and Church defence. The Church has need of the working men. But what I want most to say concerns all these matters. Men, educate yourselves to be fit to deal with these things, as you will have to deal with them. Believe in the difficulty of the problems brought before you, and don't believe in the nostrums of the quack doctor, who is going to cure everybody's maladies in a moment. No; think, study, enquire, wait. Don't set down everybody of a different class as an enemy. You are learning many lessons of co-operation in your trades; of self-government in your clubs. You are learning, I hope, brotherly love, justice, and mercy. The poor are marvellously good to the poor. Well, be just to all. Judge others by the law of charity; and in all things forget

not the love of God in Christ; forget not the great bond of holy union which the Son of God came on earth to bring to men; and do your part to make the world a better and a brighter place, and to draw together in holy Christian fellowship class to class and man to man.

The Rev. Canon Barry, D.D., Principal of King's College, London, and Bishop Designate of Sydney.

I accepted, with great pleasure, the invitation of the Church Congress Committee, to take part in this meeting, as it has been my privilege on two former occasions to address working men. But, at the same time, I feel that I could not possibly do it with anything like the authority, the freshness, and the power of those speakers who have preceded me. They have had the advantage of having had to do largely—if not exclusively—with great and practical work; one, it is true, in a country diocese far away north, and another in the crowded neighbourhood of East London. My work hitherto, as perhaps you know, has been rather more in the study, the lecture-room, and the pulpit. I have not had that same personal acquaintance with the lives of the people which belongs to those distinguished speakers who have preceded me. I must, therefore, give you what I can, and, if it is not as good as that which they gave you, I trust that, at any rate, you will pardon me. When I was asked to address this meeting, I considered what it was that distinguished it from other meetings of the Congress; and it seemed to me to be this—that at other meetings held in this room, we all met together avowedly as fellow-churchmen, but at this meeting to-night, we are met together simply as fellow-men. And let me say this to you, that any man who speaks in the faith, and in the Word of Christ, has a ground of common humanity which can belong to none other. He stands, not merely under the inspiration of natural sympathy, but he is bound, as he looks upon the face of his fellow-men, to understand this, that there is not one of them who is beyond the reach of the fatherhood of God—there is not one of them for whom the Lord Jesus Christ did not die; and there is not one of them in whose hearts—whether they listen to it or not—there is not the voice of the Holy Spirit witnessing to the great moral realities of life, of righteousness, of judgment. And, therefore, a Christian is, beyond all others, inexcusable if he cannot address his fellow-men on the ground of that common humanity in which he and they alike are made in the image of God, and redeemed by the blood of the Lord Jesus Christ. I have sometimes thought it almost a pity to call this meeting by the name of a working men's meeting. I should rather call it a men's meeting, without any definition which may seem indirectly to refer to any one class in this great community. I doubt not, in one way or another—whether on the platform, or in the body of the hall—there is not one who is not a hard-working man, and, I suppose, all those whom I address belong to the class commonly known as the working class; but you do not come here as working men—you come here simply as men. You do not want us to talk to you about your trade. I am quite sure you do not want us to talk to you about the particular duties of the working man. In the first place, perhaps, it would not be any business of ours, and, perhaps, if

we tried to do it, we should make some blunders. We should, perhaps, meet with the fate of that preacher, who, before a congregation of sailors, was describing the voyage of life in what he thought were extremely apt nautical images, and he made many preposterous blunders. In his grand peroration, he cried out, "What is the ship to do now?" There came the reply from the bottom of the hall, "Well, you lubber, I do not know what you are to do, unless you let her drift starn forrards." Therefore, if I was inclined to talk to you about your trade, I should hesitate, lest I made a similar blunder. In fact, when I heard the Bishop of Carlisle begin with the biscuit metaphor, I felt, although he was equal to almost any emergency, some anxiety until he came out triumphantly. What we are to speak of to night belongs to our broad ground of common humanity. I believe we are come together in order to get rid, as far as we can, of all that is peculiar and separate, in favour of all that is broad and common between us. Of course, there is no one who can really get rid of his individual self, with its sacred freedom and its sacred responsibilities. We may forget ourselves in our hours of relaxation for a time, but in all crises, in all that tries the mind and constitution of a man, the sense of individual freedom and responsibility will return. This gathering may, however, suggest to us, that we should strive for a few moments to see what is the other side of human life—the side not of realising, but of forgetting self—the side of self-sacrifice—the side on which a man is content to sink self in the common life of those with whom he is connected. There is no true manhood without this principle of self-forgetting and self-sacrifice. What is a man worth who cannot sink and forget self for the sake of wife and child? What is the boy or girl worth who does not show ready submission to the greater wisdom and authority of a parent? What is the wife worth who does not forget herself for the sake of her husband? From the beginning of our lives, from the day when our eyes first opened upon the world, our task has been to learn the lesson of self-sacrifice. But the lesson goes beyond the sacred circle of home. I honour the sacrifices which working men often make of their individual interests, and of interests which are far dearer to them than their own, for the sake of what they believe to be the welfare of their class. All I desire is, that you should understand that all, whether they be called masters or men, officers or rank and file, are really engaged in a common work, which binds all alike to the same great duty of mutual self-sacrifice. Then, you should remember, that you are not only members of a home, or a class, but citizens of a great country. I have no great opinion of the Englishman who cares nothing for the great interests of politics. As to the man who is born in a free country like this, and does not identify himself enough with it to take the share which the constitution gives him in shaping its destinies—I confess that such a one does not seem to me to be more than half a man, and I do not believe he is half an Englishman. I do not think we should desire the great mass of Englishmen to be mere echoes—let them rather have voices of their own. No! the more men read and think for themselves, and the more they throw themselves into the destinies of their own country, the better they will be as men, and the better, I believe, they will be as Christians. There are political questions now of great moment coming before us. I do not mean questions relating to this or that privilege, to the rights of this

or that class. Still less questions of increase of our dominions—which, to say the truth, are already as large as we can manage—but questions how we may make the life of England nobler, happier, and better. What we need is measures that will improve the wretched homes and circumstances of great masses of our people; that will diminish the drunkenness and uncleanness which are the plague-spots of our community, that will prevent the political corruption which poisons the sources of our national power, and that will give a thorough, true, and complete education to the mass of the people. The sooner such questions occupy their true position in our minds, the better will it be for the country and for you. But I must carry you a step further. Do you suppose that England was intended to consult only her own happiness and wealth? Have you ever seriously studied the map of the world, first putting your finger upon the little speck which is strangely called "Great Britain," and thinking how strange and unexampled is the power with which God has been pleased to entrust her? There is first that great western community, which has grown out of a few English colonies. Then look at the vast empire in the East, which is still our own, which is said to include one-fourth of the people of the globe, and which has come into our possession in the strangest, the most romantic, and, indeed, incredible manner. Look, again, at the great country with which I have been called on, in the providence of God, to cast in my own lot. In that country, where at this moment there are three millions of square miles, with hardly three millions of inhabitants, there is every prospect of the rising up of another vast English-speaking community. What do you suppose all this is for? Is it merely to increase our own happiness, our own power, or our own wealth? No; it is to give us Englishmen an opportunity of forgetting ourselves, by trying to serve the interests of humanity, and to promote the welfare of mankind. But the principle of self-denial and self-sacrifice can never flourish in the hearts of men, unless it be united with the faith which belongs to the religion of Christ, the belief that in serving humanity we are not serving a vague abstraction, but a God who is the Father of all humanity. Christianity created the sense of human brotherhood. There was a time when, even amongst civilised nations, a foreigner was supposed to mean the same thing as an enemy. There was no conception of this love for mankind existing as a spiritual power in the world before the proclamation in the Gospel of the Fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of men. The Lord Himself showed the pattern of this true service. He was bound to His own by the sacred love of family. He loved His country as no Roman ever loved the City of the Seven Hills, and as no Athenian the City of the Violet Crown. He gave Himself for all humanity. Why? Because He knew that devotion, as Son of Man, to a Heavenly Father, which alone can nerve humanity for the duty of self-sacrifice. If you would know how to live such a noble and true life, you must seek strength for it, not in any of those new, shadowy, nebulous kinds of gospels which are offered you, but where so many thousands have found it through so many generations of the past—in the old Gospel of our Father in heaven, who has revealed His love in the sacrifice of our Lord Jesus Christ.

The Rev. Canon Hole, Vicar of Caunton, Nottingham.

My Lords of the Episcopate—My Lords of the Creation,—I do not trace the lineaments of the gorilla in my family portraits, and I don't believe in the ancestral ape. Nevertheless, I note similitudes between us men and monkeys. For example, I was admiring, in the gardens of the Zoological Society, the affectionate attachment of two apes, when one of the keepers remarked to me, "You would hardly think, Sir, that, no long time ago, they two were always a-hating and a-fighting each other." "No, indeed," I answered, "and what made this happy change?" "Well," he said, "there used to be an ugly old baboon along with 'em, and though, when they were a-quarrelling, he always looked as if he had nothing to do with it; in fact, used to shrink into a corner, as though he were alarmed and disgusted, and couldn't a-bear to witness such unfeeling conduct, yet I somehow suspected the old humbug was at the bottom of it all; and so it proved, for when I moved him to another cage, they two had just one more set to—the biggest bout they'd ever had, and then it seemed to strike them what fools they were, and from that day to this they've been the best of friends." Just as you and I, my brothers, in our school-days, when that long tough fight was over, regarded our opponent (through the eyes which had been restored to their functions by the application of a raw beef-steak) in a new aspect, and he became our respected and respectful mate.

Accordingly, these monkeys were engaged, when I was introduced to them, in offices of mutual goodwill; in an act of the closest personal friendship—they were catching one another's fleas! Ever and anon, one of them seemed to discover a specimen of abnormal proportions, and he held it before the eyes of his companion with a demeanour which seemed to say, "I hardly expected to find such a beast as this on your charming person, but I rejoice in relieving you from its importunities;" and then he cracked it, and then—speech is silver, but silence is golden.

I left them; and sat down for meditation. And I thought sadly how many silly monkeys, called men, were always fighting, and never would be friends; and, though they had passed, and were likely to pass, their lives in the same cage, were continually suspecting, envying, irritating, and assaulting each other, when they might have peace and harmony, and might relieve one another of many disagreeable parasites. It occurred to me, that if employers and workmen, buyers and sellers, landlords and tenants, clergy and laity, would show more patient, considerate reciprocity; if, when subjects of dispute arose between classes mutually dependent, the possibility could be acknowledged that there might be faults on both sides—may I say fleas, for

> "Great fleas have little fleas upon their backs to bite 'em,
> And little fleas have lesser fleas, and so *ad infinitum*,"

instead of each blustering, "I am Sir Oracle, and when I speak let no dog bark," "My doxy is orthodoxy, and heterodoxy is yours," instead of looking at our own virtues through the most powerful of all microscopes, our self-esteem, and at our neighbour's merits through the most minimising lens which is known to science, the inverted telescope

of our self-interest, why then we might hope for harmony in lieu of discord, and confidence instead of doubt.

Then I thought of that wicked old baboon, who made the mischief, and of the peace which finally ensued when the two monkeys were left to themselves, with no flatterer to say to one of them, "You're such a pretty monkey, you ought to have a scarlet coat, and a cocked hat, and a barrel-organ, and not to associate with low and ugly apes;" no bully to suggest, "You're the biggest, hit him in the eye—you're the strongest, take his nuts;" and I remembered how much harm was done outside those gardens by vicious malcontents and restless busy-bodies, scribes, and disputers of this world, stump-orators, and penny-a-liners, "Knowing nothing, but doting about questions and strifes of words, whereof cometh envy, strife, railings, evil surmisings." I mean the sort of man who comes to you and me and says, "I always thought that you and Dick Johnson were such particular mates." And when you make answer that he has been rightly informed, that you were at school with Richard, and have liked him ever since, then he says that such being the case, he was surprised he *must* say (there's no *must* about it, only that the sneak wants to make mischief) to hear the remarks which Johnson made about you, and then he tells you something, of which half is fiction, and the other half exaggeration of some slight disparagement—but which fires you with a desire (for to be wrath with those we love doth work live madness in the brain) to punch Richard's head, and then produces a coolness which may last for life. I mean the man who says to the rich, "Don't you do anything for the poor, because they're all knaves and thieves;" and to the poor, "Mind you hate the rich, and insult them as much as possible, for they are all bloated, cruel sensualists, and never go to bed sober." I mean the sort of men who go to employers in times of great prosperity and say, "Whatever you do, don't let your people taste of it;" and in times of adversity, advise the workmen, "Now you've got him—let's have a strike." I mean the man (and I am glad to reach my main purpose, for some of you must, I fear, have been wondering what all this palaver about the monkeys meant) who says to us clergymen, "It's no good your trying to influence those working men—they're all atheists, sceptics, secularists, and freethinkers;" and then comes to you and says, "Don't you be gulled by those sleek, close-shaven parsons; they don't believe what they're paid to preach, nor does anyone else, but women and children."

I wish we could eliminate these pugnacious, mendacious incendiaries. They ought to be dealt with as two of their ancestors were dealt with in the old demented days of duelling. By their misrepresentations, they had instigated two men, who had long been friends, to fight, and had volunteered to superintend operations. Happily the combatants found out before the meeting that they had been deceived, and they made their arrangements accordingly. When the word was given to "fire," instead of shooting at each other, they shot at their seconds. One of the meddlers got a bullet in his calf, and the other heard a disagreeable whistling in the neighbourhood of his hat, and the principals said that their honour was quite satisfied, and the party broke up.

II. Now, what I mean, my brothers, is mainly this—that the more we are brought together, the more we open our hearts to each other, the

more we act upon the Divine injunction, "If thy brother shall trespass against thee," be he rich or poor, "go and tell him his fault between thee and him alone: if he shall hear thee, thou hast gained thy brother," and the less we have to do with "debates, envyings, wraths, strifes, backbitings, whisperings, swellings, tumults;" the more we realise our inseparable interests, socially as a nation, and above all, our true fraternity, our exact equality, both in our privileges and in our duties, as Christians; then I am sure of this, that the more we thus know, so much the more shall we respect and love one another, and that as we recognise the necessity and feel the desire, we shall have the power, to help each other, in resisting that which is false and evil, and in encouraging that which is true and good.

And I speak the happiest thought which is in my heart to-night, when I say that there exists on both sides a great desire for this reciprocity and intercourse, and that the desire arises from the purest of all motives, and the noblest of all ambitions. I do not say that it is universal, nor even general, but I do say that it is felt by the most thoughtful, the most earnest, and the most energetic of those on either side. I am not uttering conjectures or theories, and I am not dreaming sentimental dreams. I speak from experience and from facts. I *know* that with hundreds of the clergy, from the chief to the curate, it is a principal purpose for which they labour and pray, it is their devout and brightest hope, to make the Church in which they serve more worthy of the proud title which she bears, the Church of England, to establish it in the hearts of the people (a locality which is beyond the jurisdiction of Parliament), and to endow it with treasures which no gold can buy, and which this world can neither give nor take. And I *know* hundreds of working men—it has been my privilege for many years to be amongst them from time to time in different parts of the country and in different departments of their labour—I know hundreds of working men, who as soon as they are satisfied as to the sincerity of the intention (and it doesn't take them three minutes to ascertain whether you speak to them from the head or from the heart, from a cold sense of duty, or from the warm impulse of a brother's love) will sympathise with quick and complete assent with the motives which bring you to them—just as you have responded to the invitation of this Congress in the spirit which proposed it.

III. "All very fine," says monkey number 3, "but let me tell you that the working men only come and listen to you because you laud and extol them, because you tell them that they're the flower of creation, and the salt of the earth. You don't really care for them, but you're in a precious funk, because they are gradually gaining power, and so you fall down and worship the rising sun."

That statement is three-fifths of a *libel;* and I earnestly exhort my younger brothers of the clergy not to be so misled by it as to suppose that he will propitiate working men by flattery. When he first goes among them, and they seem a little shy of him (they have not been much favoured with clerical visitors), when they survey him as they have surveyed me—a thousand of them—very much as a strange dog coming into a town is inspected by the canine residents, he may be tempted to exaggerate his own benevolence, and the claims of his hearers upon it. I warn him against an utterance of extreme affection,

because whatever may be their personal attractions, they won't believe that he has fallen in love at first sight with a grimy face adorned with a short pipe and billy-cock; and I would dissuade him from expatiating too much upon their virtues, or some of them having a sense of humour may indulge in a festive wink.

In what spirit then shall the churchman speak to those who seldom or never worship with him? My brothers, since you cannot reply for yourselves to-night (if you should ever send an invitation to working parsons to listen to you, I will come from any distance) may I answer this question for you?

He must speak as one who is fully assured that the material of which he is composed is not superior in quality to that of other folk; and that there is no reason whatever to believe that had he been placed in their circumstances he would have been better or wiser than they.

Wherefore, there must be no patronising. On the contrary, because he belongs to a family which has been verily guilty concerning their brother, which has neglected, slighted, and estranged him, to a Church which has disobeyed the bidding of her Divine Master, "Go out quickly into the streets and lanes of the city, and bring in hither the poor and the maimed, and the halt and the blind—Go out into the highways and hedges, and compel them to come in that My House may be full"—he must speak in all humility.

And he must speak, not only as a churchman, as an ordained priest, and as a preacher by profession, but as one who *knows*, who has the witness within himself, that in delivering the Gospel message, and in inviting to the means of grace, he is teaching, he is offering that which can make those who hear him wise unto salvation—happy now and for ever.

Then he will find that he is speaking to men who feel as he does, that they might be better than they are, and who long to know, and who are thankful to be told how they may be better. He will find that the old sorrowful cry is ever rising in the human heart, "O wretched man that I am! who shall deliver me from the body of this death?" and that, if in a spirit of prayerful faith and love, he delivers his message in answer, "Behold I bring you glad tidings of great joy: for unto you is born a Saviour," he will be welcomed as the messenger of peace.

I have heard of a lad, who was treated with so much harsh severity by his parents, because he was not quite so clever as his brothers and sisters, that he suddenly disappeared from his home, and was not heard of for years. Then a reliable report came that he had been recognised in a distant land, and his mother entreated a friend who was going there to make enquiry, and, if he found him, to give him a letter. At last he found him, but he seemed to have lost all his interest in the old country, and to be quite indifferent as to his family. Then the friend gave him his mother's letter. He took it reluctantly, as though he hardly cared to read it, but as he read a great change came over him. For she wrote that she had never ceased to mourn for him all those years since he left, and that she bitterly repented of the unkindness which had driven him away—that she asked forgiveness, and besought him to return. He put down the letter on the table by which he sat, he hid his face in his hands, and burst into tears. Then he

seemed to be considering in an agony of intense emotion what he should do; and then he raised his head, and spoke his resolution, "Tell her that I am coming home."

And so I believe that if the Church of England seeks those whom she has estranged, and tells them of her sorrow and of her heart's desire for reunion, and proves the sincerity of her appeal by preparing to welcome those who shall accept it, by throwing open her doors always and to all (exterminating those fleas, and moths, and beetles which have hid themselves so long in her exclusive pews), arranging her times of service to the opportunities of all, and adapting the services themselves to the ready use and understanding of all; why then I am confident that in God's good time she will hear the answer, for which so many of us are working with all our energy and praying with all our hearts, "Tell her that we are coming home."

There may be many failures, but the final victory is sure when work perseveres and prays—

> "For the sound of the anvil seems to say,
> That 'tis good to work as well as to pray;
> And prayer, which comes with work at its side
> Was never in heaven or earth denied."

The Right Hon. Sir John Mowbray, Bart., M.P.

I am not sure that the President has done an act of kindness, either to you or to me, in asking me to address you after the five stirring speeches to which you have listened to-night. I have been called upon unexpectedly by his lordship this evening, and am unprepared to address you, because, as you know, my name was not on the list of speakers prepared by the committee. When I reflect what a spiritual and intellectual treat you have had, how you have had the loftiest oratory, the noblest sentiments, garnished with the most lively illustrations, and when I recollect the speech of the last speaker, still ringing in your ears, and the enthusiasm which has not yet subsided, I know not how a very common-place politician can venture to say even a word to you. And yet, when the privilege is offered to me to address, for the first time in my life, so magnificent an assembly as this, I feel bound to avail myself of it, as I feel myself also bound to obey the lord bishop. And may I say, too, that I do it with no little satisfaction, for although it is my pride and privilege now to represent the University of Oxford, a constituency which I may say is second to none in the land, I can look back fifteen years to the time when it was my good fortune to represent a constituency composed to a large extent of working men; and it was a great pleasure and delight when once a year I came down and addressed them in the town hall. I am afraid that, politically, it was often the case that six out of ten of my audience did not agree with my political opinions. But I must say this, that a more kindly audience, more considerate and indulgent listeners, more courteous persons, I never had the pleasure of addressing in my life; and I always felt when I left my northern borough to represent a more cultured and enlightened constituency, that I had

lost a real pleasure in not being brought into contact once a year with a large body of the working class. Well, you have been reminded to-night by several speakers that you belong to the Church, and that the Church belongs to you. The President has told you that he is your servant, ready to labour in your cause upon every occasion that he may be able to do so. You know that the pastors of your several parishes are always ready to perform all the offices of religion ; to visit you in sickness, to comfort you in sorrow, and to relieve you in distress. I wish that instead of my being called upon to address you some one in the hall had sent up his name, and had been called upon to address the gentlemen on the platform. But let me remind you, if you do not do this to-night, it is in your power as members of the Church to take part in various branches of the Church's work. The Church is open to you all to take part in her services, she is the Church of the nation, and she requires you all as baptized Christians and members of her Communion—for she supposes you all in union with her—to help to do her work. You can avail yourselves of her services; you can take part in the administration of the work of the parish ; nay, I am sure we would welcome you to our Diocesan Conferences and Church Congresses. What reason is there that working men should not attend the Diocesan Conferences that meet at Oxford? I can tell you that we have had many a yeoman, many a humble agriculturist, come and take part in our debates, and they have been listened to with great attention and respect. Let me carry my experience further, and remind you that we have in the House of Commons two members especially sent by the working men—I mean the member for Morpeth and the member for Stoke-upon-Trent. I appeal to many colleagues of mine who sit behind me, and who are members of the House of Commons, if upon every occasion the utterances from these two most highly honourable men—Mr. Burt, and Mr. Broadhurst—are not received with the greatest respect, as if they came from the first orator, or the most distinguished statesman who addresses the House. Their utterances may be plain and less adorned with eloquence than those of many other members, but then they speak the sentiments of their fellow working men. They are therefore listened to with great respect, and there is no occasion upon which they would not be welcomed by any audience which they might address. We have heard from one speaker—I think Canon Barry—that he regretted this was not called a meeting merely of men. But we know there is a certain class who live by their labour, and it is perfectly well known in the House of Commons that the honourable gentlemen to whom I alluded did, years ago, actually work with their own hands, one of them having helped to build the very edifice in which the legislature now sits. Well, I ask you to come forward and take part in all the proceedings of your country and your Church, to which you are entitled as citizens and as churchmen, and you will be welcomed, and cordially received and listened to. In conclusion, I thank you very much for the kind way in which my remarks have been listened to.

The Right Rev. the PRESIDENT.

IN bidding you all a "good night," I hope I may conclude—may I not—that you have enjoyed your evening. And I may say, for those around me, that for the present there will be no greater satisfaction to them than to know that you have enjoyed yourselves. For my own part, I hope I shall often meet you again. For the others, I am sure I may say that they will be very glad to meet you, either in this your town or wherever the changes and chances of life may bring them into your company. Good night!

OVERFLOW MEETING

HELD IN THE

ALBERT HALL,

WEDNESDAY EVENING, OCTOBER 3RD.

The Very Rev. the DEAN OF YORK in the Chair.

ADDRESSES.

The CHAIRMAN.

IT would always be of great interest to be asked to take the chair at such a meeting as this, but I confess that the reason why I have been asked to take the chair at this meeting possesses the greatest possible interest to me. I am not asked to take the chair because I happen to fill an eminent position of any very great prominence in the Church. There are men of much greater distinction here than I am. Neither have I been asked here because I am supposed to be possessed of powers of great eloquence, because there are those amongst us far more gifted by God than I am in that respect; but I was asked to take the chair because it was felt I was one known, at all events to a great number of you, and who would therefore take this place here to-night as a friend whom you know, and in whose motives and intentions, I hope, you would have the most perfect confidence. I cannot see your faces to-night, because of the arrangement of the lighting of this hall, but I have no doubt that if I could see them I should see the faces of some whom I remember in days gone by, when it was my happiness and privilege to work amongst you; and if I could see them I should not only see the cordial smile which has greeted me so constantly at almost every turn, but I should also see that your faces all show that time is passing on, that we are all getting older, and that while we do meet again, yet that we are not just the same men as we were when we last parted. I come here into Reading once again, and I find that many places are vacant, and faces gone, and I see unmistakeable traces on all my friends of the fact that we are getting older. Many of us are

getting some grey hairs; some of us have not many hairs left at all. Everything tells us that life is passing away, and we must be up and doing—making use of our opportunities before they pass away from us altogether. It may be asked why it is that in a Congress of this sort there should be what is called a Working Men's Meeting—why they should be particularly invited to come here more than any other class of men. I think there are three reasons that may be given for that. In the first place, one cannot help feeling that you, as working men generally, are advancing in the great question of education, and there are great difficulties which now present themselves to you which did not exist so much among the working men of the days gone by. In former days the working men troubled their heads very little upon the intricate questions of our faith, because they were not educated. That had been a matter they could put on one side very much, and felt all they had to do was to accept what was the faith of their fathers before them. It is not so with the working men of the present generation. Education is advancing, and a great and happy thing it is. But with that great blessing there comes great responsibility, and you will find as you advance in education you are brought face to face with religious difficulties of which your fathers knew nothing, and of which, perhaps, a few years ago you knew very little. Then, again, as regards the question of wages. The working men are, on the whole, very much better off now than some years ago. Wages, on the whole, are higher, and many of those things which were considered luxuries, within the reach of the rich only, are now within the reach of working men. And access to luxuries brings with it peculiar temptations, and of a subtle character, which need the grace of God in order that you may overcome them, and it is felt that a word in season on such a question may not be out of place. And, once again, one cannot shut one's eyes to the fact that as years go on the position of working men as regards politics is changed. In former days working men had scant views upon politics at all. Whatever they thought, they were very much at the mercy of those in whose employment they were, or from whom they might derive some worldly advantage. But now the working men have a distinct share in the political power, and the law endeavours to take care that every working man should be free in the exercise of his political rights, to use them in that way which may commend itself to his judgment. It is not my wish, nor is it the wish of anyone who may address you here, to sway your politics one way or the other; but in the use of that right you should remember it is a trust committed to you by God, that it is a matter which, as you have now an opportunity of dealing with it, you should deal with it on real and true principles—on principles of honour, thoughtfulness, and consideration; not upon the impulse or impressions of the moment, but guided by what you feel would really be best for the good of the State, of which you, in God's providence, are members. These are matters which especially concern the working men of to-day. They have risen up, and are assuming a very different position in the present to what they did in the past, and probably in the future they will assume a very different position to what they do in the present. And our whole wish is, I am sure, to help you to deal with those opportunities and privileges, and with the temptations and difficulties naturally surrounding them, on the one principle which we feel is the only right

principle, and that is the distinctly religious principle. It seems that, as these opportunities and privileges have more and more added to your influence, so the great principle by which alone that influence can be guided and directed aright is assailed. If there is one difficulty more than another which you have to face, it is this very question of religious faith. There never was a time, or has not been a time for years, in which the assaults on religious faith have been more virulent than at the present moment. And I am sure you will find, if you really wish in your own conscience to deal with that difficulty, or to meet the assaults upon religious principles, you will find those religious principles, as you hold them, will all sooner or later be assailed. We see it on all sides. The very existence of a God is called in question. The authority of the Word of God is called in question. And those who assail these great principles speak so loud, and with so confident a voice, that those who have not examined the matter carefully, and have not laid a strong foundation for their faith, are apt to think that Christianity is almost what its assailants would wish it to be—a worn-out superstition, which must be abandoned by men who think. Among the many works which I had the pleasure of taking part in when amongst you is one which I am thankful to see is now established at Reading, and that is the Free Library. I remember we had several meetings upon that subject, and I was invited to preside over a committee of working men to work towards the end we had in view. But I suppose public feeling was not then quite ripe upon the subject, and we failed to carry out what we had in view. Indeed, I feel thankful that we did fail, because it is now done much better than we could have done it then. But now you have a Free Library, I hope you will use it, not merely to cast a glance upon the current literature of the day, but as a means for really considering questions from all their different sides, so as to form a judgment upon them; and especially those questions of religious doubt, which to many came as a surprise. Brought up, it may be, to consider that as a matter of course the principles of Christianity are unassailable, many are too easily overcome by the opposition and perils by which they are assailed. Now the student who has read, I won't say very deeply, but with ordinary care, and who has devoted time to anything like a proper comprehensive reading, knows at once that these assaults on Christianity are nothing new; that they have been made again and again, and answered again and again; and that, as far as the assailants are concerned, that if they are united in their assaults upon Christianity, it is the only point upon which they are united, because they are divided into opposite camps among themselves, and the best answer you can find to the assaults of one sceptic or atheist is to read the works of another. But, then, these are matters which are not present to the minds of the generality of working men—to those who are not readers; and therefore there is a great advantage, which, I feel, has been conferred upon you by the establishment of the Free Library, which advantage I hope you will not allow to remain unused, of really studying questions on all sides, and so confirming your faith. You may depend upon it, the older we grow the more convinced we become—those of us, I mean, who take the Bible in our hands and use it, not as a missile for hurling at other people, but as a lantern to our feet and a light to our path, the more we become convinced, and the more the experience of life proves

to us incontestably the authority of the Word of God. Those who have taken up the Bible in that way, who have used it among all the chequered circumstances of daily life, listen with very little concern to the apparent discrepancies some people think they have found out, or the wonderful discovery of this philosopher or that; those who, on the one hand, deny there is any God, or who, on the other hand, say there is just as much error in dogmatically asserting that there is no God as in asserting that there is, and that man has nothing but uncertainty. The man who loves his Bible, and who lives upon it, is free from the assaults of such people as these. He knows in Whom he has believed. Like David of old, he has tried his weapons, and having found them prevail he is not afraid to go forth against the Goliath of Gath before the armies of Israel. I have here the Bible which I have had ever since I was ordained 30 years ago. Many whom I have visited in times of sickness and sorrow will remember how from these pages we always found just the comfort and guidance and direction we wanted; and I trust also that, not only at those times, but day by day for instruction in the duties of daily life we have turned to the same great value of God's law, and have found from it that guidance in life's difficulties, and that wholesome warning in life's sunshine which has strengthened our feet and kept our paths, and enabled us to walk in the narrow way that leadeth to eternal life. But it is not for me to deal at length with these subjects. There are those here who have come prepared to speak to you, and who will speak to you with much greater power than I can. I trust that the result of our meeting together will be to strengthen our faith, cheer our hearts, and assure us we are treading the right way; to make us more and more determined to cleave to the old faith of our fathers, believing that that is the faith of intelligence and of liberty, as well as the faith of truth; and as we have been permitted to meet here together again, feeling we are so much nearer the great Father's house above, so may we feel that whether we be permitted to meet here again on earth or not, we may have a sure and certain hope of standing side by side at the last great day.

The Bishop of Bedford, the Rev. Canon Hole, and the Bishop of Carlisle then delivered in substance the speeches which are to be found in the report of the meeting at the Congress Hall.

The Rev. Canon Knox-Little.

The Revised MS. of this Speech was not returned in time for insertion here, and appears as Appendix B.

The Rev. Henry Roe, Rector of Poyntington, Somerset.

My dear friends,—I came here to listen, and now I have been called upon to speak. You are living here in the very centre of life and action; I come from a poor little parish of about 140 people. I expect we could put them all in the gallery, and put the church and houses almost

into this hall. Why, then, do I speak to you at all? The one reason is this—I think we are not only made of the same material, but we are all working men; at least, I think I am a working man. I sometimes get up early in the morning, and when the end of the 14 or 15 hours' day comes, I feel the need of a little rest. And I will tell you another reason why I am glad I have been asked to stand up before you. In my little parish I see in the specimen what you have here in the bulk. What is actually the unit of life and happiness? The family, is it not? I have got some families in my parish, and in those families what do I see? I see exactly what it is that makes one family happy and another family miserable. What is the husband, who is the "band" of the house? Where there is a good husband, where there is a man who not only works hard, but who says, "I have got those dear children to bring up, my wife to make happy, and my respectability to maintain," and who earnestly and honestly tries to do it, I see that home is a happy home. The children of such a man come regularly to school, and then what do I see? Well, I see the minds of those dear little children expand and open and take in religious truth, and by-and-by they grow up into young men and young women, and I was going to say they don't want to be taught lessons in purity. They grow up pure as the flowers they gather, and they grow up young men and women whom you might always be proud to call your own brothers and sisters. These are the homes I want to see everywhere, and such a home each one of you may make. You may live in a big town, to be sure, you may want gardens and flowers, but the homes you make may be just as happy. You have just the husband and wife, with one single united thought: "Here we have to live together and to bring up these dear children that God has given us to His honour and glory. We won't spend our money in the public-house; we are children of a Father who lives up there and we will pray together; we will read our Bible together." One of the happiest pictures I am able to look back upon is when I sat, forty years ago, as one of a family of ten children, reading verse by verse of the Bible with a father now in heaven, holding the big Bible in the centre of us all. Would to God that "verseying," as it used to be called, was a practice now in every home in Reading; we should hear then little about the difficulties of the Christian faith. Well, what is to be the outcome of this great meeting? Some years ago I was present at some rejoicings in connection with a noble lord coming of age, and among other amusements there was a greasy pole; to be strictly correct it was not greasy but made slippery by soap; and at the top there was a leg of mutton. A great many boys tried to work their way up this pole, and a great many came down faster than they went up. But there was one fellow whom I shall never forget; his face was so thin, and he had almost nothing on his bones apparently. He was looking at the leg of mutton with more eagerness than any one, and I am ashamed to say I didn't know why that was, though, perhaps, I ought to have known it. After some vain attempts by others he came timidly forward and said, "let me try." He did try; he went up eight, nine, or ten feet, and the leg of mutton was within two feet of his fingers; but he stayed there clinging to the pole for five or ten minutes. The people below getting impatient said, "Come down," but he said "No;" and by-and-by he went a little

higher; eighteen or nineteen inches more and he would reach the goal. The people again shouted, "Come down," but he still stuck to the pole, and by-and-by he just managed to touch the leg of mutton with his fingers and it became his. Why did that young man so determinedly stick to that pole? I will tell you. His home was at that moment without one particle of food; he had a drunken man for a father, and he was motherless, and he didn't seem to have a friend in the world. Now, look again; you and I have something to stick to. What is it? We have our Christian profession to stick to, and our hopes of glory. Let us stick to that, and pray to God to bring us nearer and nearer to the goal.

The Right Rev. Bishop Abraham, Canon and Precentor of Lichfield, late Bishop of Wellington.

When I came into this hall, one of my kind friends asked me to say a few words if required. I said I hadn't intended to say anything, and I think it a great liberty to take with any audience, to address them without due consideration of the subject I should speak about; but as the different speakers went on they touched chords in my memory from time to time, and I got a little more courage, and sent a note to my good friend, Archdeacon Emery, who we may call the father of the Church Congress, to say that if there was no one else I would gladly say a few words. The first thought that came into my mind, the first chord that was struck was caused by a reference to the Colonies. I remembered that thirty-three years ago, when I was living in the neighbourhood of Windsor, I had in my service a gardener and a very excellent housemaid, who came from the immediate neighbourhood of Reading; and when I was going to New Zealand they came and said they were going to be married, and they would very much like to go with me. I took them with me, and we were to see whether we could help one another. I need not go on further with this story than to tell you, that twenty years after I had been in New Zealand, in 1869, I was coming home, and I went to see my old servant just before I started, and I said to him:—"When I go back to England, if I go near Reading, and see your friends, they will ask me whether you are satisfied with your position here, and I should like to know what you have to say for yourself?" And he said:—"Well, you recollect the home that I lived in; there was no floor to the house we lived in; there was nothing but the bare ground, and we were very poor people. My wife and I saved £50 in your service, and here I bought a few cows and a little piece of land. Then I built myself a house, and became a milkman in the neighbourhood of a large town; and if you come with me to the top of this hill, you can look down on my house, and my property, my flocks and my herds." And I did look down upon them; and he said to me:—"Well, you may tell my friends in Reading, and my wife's friends, that whereas I came out to this country with only fifty pounds in my pocket, I suppose that I am worth now a good round sum. All the land you see round about here is mine. And how did I get it? I will tell you distinctly how I got it. I got it by industry and sobriety.

I was a sober man, and I was industrious; and from what I have told you, my friends may judge whether I like the new country or not." That is a story showing the good of temperance the other side of the world. When I came back here, I went not long ago to see some water-works being made for a city, and I was looking over them, when a workman came out—it was about five or six in the afternoon—and as is the custom with many workmen, he asked me for something to drink for looking over the buildings. I said:—"My dear friend, that is rather hard on me, I am a teetotaller, and I have no idea of giving you anything to drink. And I am a teetotaller for this reason. I don't mean to boast about it. I was no drunkard, but I gave up wine, etc., to show how a man who did much labour could do without alchoholic stimulant. Therefore it seems hard that I, as a teetotaller, to set you an example, should be called upon to give you something to drink." The foreman said:—"Are you a teetotaller to set us an example? Then I wouldn't for a moment ask you to give us anything to drink." That man was at all events interested in temperance, and had seen the advantage of it. Another point which touched a chord in my memory was the subject of infidelity. Three or four years ago, I was one Sunday in the Potteries engaged in my duties, and at every place I went to—I went to three that day—there was a man placarded to speak on Atheism, and that man was Charles Bradlaugh. His name was on every wall, aud the next day (Monday) he was invited to meet several of the clergy in a large hall in that Pottery town. Some thousand potters came into the hall to hear the subject discussed between Bradlaugh and one of the clergy. When we were all assembled on the platform, the chairman said:—Will Mr. Bradlaugh step forward on to the platform?" But there was no response. He then said:—"Is Mr. Bradlaugh here?" and somebody called out in the hall—"He went to town by the three o'clock train." The clergyman who was going to discuss the question with him said:—"Went to town by the three o'clock train? That looks like—well, I would rather not say what it looks like. But I happen to have in my pocket Mr. Bradlaugh's work on Atheism. Therefore, as he is not here, and so many people are here, I will ask the chairman to read a passage from Mr. Bradlaugh's work. And his argument began in this way:—"It is no good two persons coming together to talk on religion, unless we have a clear definition of what religion is. I call upon you clergymen or laymen to define God." "That," said the clergyman, "seems a very specious and difficult question to answer. But the mistake Mr. Bradlaugh has made in calling upon me to define God lies in this; that the definition of any subject whatever is not the beginning, but the conclusion and the outcome of knowledge. I speak, for instance, about the Potteries, and I ask you to define the Potteries. Would you call upon a man who had worked here five-and-twenty years to answer that question, and who knew all about it, or would you call upon a boy who came into the Potteries last week?" And there was a shout—"The man who knew most about it." "Then," he said, "supposing a man were to tell you to define a man, must not you, in order to do that, be a person who knows a great deal about the physical construction of man; about his mind, about his requirements, about his social wants, about his soul? Would you not have to be a man who studied the whole subject of human nature? Or would the most

ignorant person in the room be able to do it?" Again those many voices responded—"The man who had studied his subject." "Well, then," this clergyman said, "as Mr. Bradlaugh is not here, will some of you, who are his friends, stand up and ask me questions?" And one of his friends did get up, and said:—"Yes: we want to know what possible sense there is in prayer?" Well, he gave the answer, and the upshot of it all was, that the two or three men who had asked him questions on behalf of Mr. Bradlaugh, proposed and seconded a vote of thanks to this clergyman who had dealt with the subject so clearly, and they all rose to their feet, and gave three hearty cheers for the Church. One more thing I must tell you, though I don't know whether I ought. It is in reference to Canon Knox-Little's story of the boy who would say his prayers on his knees. There are some of my friends in this hall, perhaps—though I may not know them—who remember that I was at one time a master at Eton. Here is one of my friends who was a boy under me (the Rev. N. T. Garry). Thank God he is vicar of St. Mary's, Reading, now. But when I was a master at Eton, I can recollect an Eton boy had rather a hard time of it. There was plenty of "the world" Canon Knox-Little spoke of in those days. Seventy boys were sometimes turned loose without a master, with no one to look after them, and nothing but their own good sense and the grace of God to help them. I can recollect there was a boy at Eton, when I was a master there, who got near the top of the school, and one day he proposed to those seventy boys that they should say their prayers. They had never said them before; not one of them had ever dared to get on their knees and say his prayers before the rest. And this boy at the head of the school had the courage to say:—"Is it not a shame that we Christian boys don't dare say our prayers, though we know we ought to in our hearts. No doubt there are many of us who say them in our beds, but not one of us has the courage to kneel down by our bed-side and to say our prayers. But I intend to do it to-night." He knelt down and said his prayers, and the other seventy boys knelt down too. But, mind you—and here comes the thing that ought to go home to your hearts, my dear friends, here in Reading, and in the diocese of Oxford; I hope it won't appear in the paper; I hope the press will omit this part of my speech, because I should not like it to go forth to-morrow morning in the papers—that boy who said his prayers on his knees, and led that whole body of seventy boys to say their prayers also, was the present Bishop of Oxford.

The Ven. W. EMERY, Archdeacon and Canon of Ely, Permanent Secretary of Church Congresses.

I HAVE been asked to say a few words to conclude this meeting. This is the twenty-third Church Congress. We began in Cambridge, and under very great difficulties. A dear friend of mine, a late Eton boy, and a fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge, with myself and others, one of whom you have heard to-night, the Bishop of Carlisle, thought it most desirable that we should have from year to year, churchmen, meeting face to face, to help one another to consider the circumstances of the Church of England, and to endeavour to strengthen the Church,

and to help her in her action. But we had a great many difficulties to meet, and many told us not to move in any such direction. Thank God we did not listen to them. The feeling that the object was good, and certainly could do no harm, and that great good might result, prevailed. We had our meeting. Three hundred met in King's College Hall, 22 years ago, and a marvellous success there was with that little meeting. Great enthusiasm prevailed, and many lasting friendships were made. Men who thought they could not agree found they did agree. Many difficulties were cleared up, and men's ideas of what the Church of England should be were broadened and deepened; and it was found that, practically, churchmen were in agreement on chief points. So it was said, "Don't let this be the last meeting, but the first of a series," and it was determined to go to Oxford. Next year we went there, and some of you know that it was the marvellous power of the president on that occasion—the late Bishop Wilberforce—which was one of the main causes of Church Congresses being continued. But I want to tell you a story about that which carries a good moral. When the first Congress was over, I met a man, very eminent in many ways, but very cautious. I had done my very best to bring him to King's Hall, because I knew what an excellent effect his presence would have, but it was in vain. He told me his position was one of observation, he could not come, but would observe all we did. I met him soon afterwards, and told him what had happened. I said we had had a very great success. "I am very delighted to hear it; but now," he said, "let me give you a piece of advice." I replied I should be very happy to listen to it, and if my conscience told me it was good, I would try to follow it. "You tell me," he continued, "that the Congress at King's Hall has been a great success. Well, then, as it may not be a success next time, don't hold another." I answered I could not agree with that advice. The first Congress had done a great deal of good, and I was perfectly persuaded the next would do more. And so it did; and Congresses have gone on ever since increasing, I may truly say, in interest and usefulness. Well, the moral of that kind of advice is this: We may be over cautious. We may really omit to do good for fear of doing harm. When, then, we know or believe that a certain course is right, we must not always let the caution of others, and still less the sneers and opposition of others, hinder us from doing what we believe is right and well. And now I think we can congratulate ourselves on the results of 22 years of Church Congresses. If I could tell you all that has gone on in connection therewith—the growth of kindly feeling, the increase of charitable work, the promotion, or at least the encouragement, of many valuable agencies for the moral and spiritual education and improvement of the people—if I could tell you all this, I am sure you would agree with me—I believe you do—in thanking God that the young men 22 years ago determined to go forward with this work. One of the most pleasing results—I think I may also say one of the most beneficial results—has been to bring the old mother Church before the working men in great centres of industry, and in a way which has proved, I hope, to the working men of England, that her privileges and her ministrations are for them, and that her chief pastors and ministers are not afraid to come face to face with the bone and sinew of England; and are not ashamed before them to say they love their Church, and

believe that by God's help it may do for others what it is doing for those who avail themselves of its services, help them on through this world to the happier world beyond. Our Congresses have done much hitherto in this direction, and I hope this one will do much also, and prove to the working men here, and elsewhere, that the Church of England is not a mere aristocratic community, with no sympathies for the people, but that she is in truth the Church of the people, and that some of her most eminent members, such as you have heard this evening, and such humble persons as myself, are one with you—one as fellow sinners, and also, may I say, as fellow saints; or, at least, as those who desire with God's help and the grace of the Holy Spirit to become changed and renewed in the likeness of Christ; so that whatever distinctions—and there must be distinctions in this world—there may be amongst us in the way of differences of opinion, of education, or position in society, that all these may be forgotten in the fact that we are all one in Christ Jesus; one in faith, one in hope, and one in love. I find sometimes when I am going about the streets—I don't suppose it is so at Reading—a sort of scowl come over the face of working men when a parson goes by them; but I am sure that that arises from a wrong impression about us. Why the great majority of us clergy are sons of working men. I am the son of a working man. It was by the steady toil of my dear father and mother, and by their diligence in seeking an honest livelihood, that I was enabled to go to the University. It is mainly to their hard earnings, and their loving exertions, with God's blessing thereon, that I am indebted for the position I am in to-day. One of the glories of our old National Church is this—that she does not regard differences of station, and that her principles are to help all, and to teach all a common brotherhood, and that not merely a common brotherhood in flesh and blood, but a common brotherhood in the great Brother of all—Jesus Christ. My father did what you have been urged to do to-night, and I trust you will do. I look back to my early days, when on a Sunday evening—I was his only child—he would sit me down on his knee, and as I grew up, place me on a chair, and would read with me chapter after chapter, verse by verse, of the Bible; he would have family prayer; he would go to church and take me with him. When he was asked at the beginning of his struggling life to increase his earnings by carrying on business on Sundays, "No," he said; "God demands one holy day, and I trust Him." He tried as the old Church would have us all try, to seek first of all the kingdom of God and His righteousness. Now, my dear friends, I hope you will go away with the determination, not only to say how very pleased you have been, how very glad you are that the Congress has come to Reading, but with a determination, God helping you, to attend to the very good advice which those who have preceded me have given you, and above all to use the spiritual advantages which you have so fully within your reach in this town. I was delighted that you cheered to the very echo a clergyman of the Church of England who said that the churches should be free and open. Well, what I say to you is this: in a good many places the churches are free and open; and I fancy in Reading they are to a great extent so; but, unfortunately, we don't find even then that those who cheer the sentiments always make use of the spiritual advantages open to them.

In conclusion, I press on you this. The Church of England is the old National Church, which has been the Church of the country for a thousand years and more. Love the dear old Church, and not only because it is the Church of your forefathers, but because it is a portion of the Church which Jesus Christ came to establish on the earth; because it holds the truth as it is in Jesus; and because, if you faithfully use the privileges and benefits which that Church offers you in the Master's Name, it will assuredly help you, as it has for hundreds of years helped others, to forget the things that are behind, and to reach forward to the things that are before, and by God's blessing, through the Redeemer's merits, bring you to heaven, to happiness and peace eternal, to the praise and the glory of God in Christ Jesus, our Blessed Lord and Saviour.

TOWN HALL,

WEDNESDAY EVENING, OCTOBER 3RD.

The LORD BISHOP OF MEATH in the Chair.

FOREIGN MISSIONS.

PAPER.

The Lord BISHOP OF LAHORE.

WE must all, I believe, be ready to admit that most solemn calls and startling appeals have reached the Church of England during the last eighty or ninety years to gird itself to the work of evangelising the non-Christian races of the world; those especially whom the great stretch of our empire, and the consequent growth of the number of our colonial sees, has brought us in contact with, or embraced; and whom it would be inexcusable, therefore, and heartless to leave out in the cold, dark, wastes of Paganism; "*strangers and foreigners*," instead of "*fellow-citizens of the saints and of the household of God*."

The alarum-bell which has awakened us has come sometimes in the form of the histories of the lives and labours, and the spoken or written appeals, of apostolic men, such as Bishops Mackenzie, Stier, Patteson, Moule, Stirling, Caldwell, and Callaway; and such presbyters as H. Martyn, Noble, Bruce, and Gordon. And, yet again, we have been put to the blush as we have listened to the stirring exhortations, the stern expostulations, the loving rebukes of our sloth, avarice, cowardice, self-indulgence, which issued from the lips of Bishops Wilberforce and Selwyn, of Henry Venn, and Hugh Stowell.

And all these rendered more forcible and impressive by events of God's Providence, such as the Mutiny in India; improved communications by

land and sea; increased amity and intercourse of nations severed aforetime by insurmountable barriers; highways cast up across or beside the vast lakes and rivers of Africa, of North-West America, and Central Asia, presenting the most unlooked-for facilities to enterprise, commerce, and travel; more than one colonial see founded for every year since Bishops Short and Austen entered on their long and fruitful episcopates in Adelaide and British Guiana; and the remarkable tendency they have exhibited to enlist the sympathies, and rally round them the energies, of able and laborious men and women, endowed with rich mental gifts and spiritual graces.

The question is, How far has the Church responded, and is responding? By what methods and with what measure of success? Is the prospect hopeful? What mistakes are there which past experience might enable us to rectify? In ages to come what judgment is the Church likely to pass upon our missionary agencies?

Many ask these questions tremblingly, as I also do; because I have a sorrowful conviction that the Church of the future will, in some important respects at least, profit rather from being warned by our mistakes than helped by the records of our wisdom, courage, abilities, and patient constancy and perseverance.

I dare not say in our defence that mission work is so new to the Church of England that a long season of experiment and tentative effort was excusable and was to be expected. We have the Acts of the Apostles in our hands, and the history of the missions of our Anglo-Saxon forefathers, of late vividly pourtrayed to us by Canons Bright and Maclear, and I must surely add the records of the toils and sufferings, the zealous and faithful services, of the Moravian Brethren.

And, if I am to confess honestly what some of us conscientiously believe, I should say that it is our attempt to invent fresh models and courses of action, instead of drawing largely and yet thoughtfully on the experiences of the past, adapted to the conditions and possibilities of the present, and throwing ourselves with ventures of unfaltering faith into those old missionary pathways;—it is this which must be largely credited with our failures and limited successes in the East.

Here, again, we must speak with some reluctance, because in stating these results of a fairly long experience and observation of the field of missions, we are in conflict with the opinion of men whose judgments we profoundly respect, and who consider that the success of modern missions will invite comparison with the success of missions in the Apostolic days; which, if true, would go far towards lulling us to rest in the comfortable assurance that nothing in our present agencies and methods needs to be seriously regretted or materially corrected, and that all fair and reasonable expectations have been satisfied. I should gladly think they are right; but I am sure the martyred Gordon did not think so; and, I own, I agree with him, though in so saying I condemn sorrowfully myself and others. The charge, if verified, falls not so much on the societies or missionary orders, or on the Church whose handmaids they are, as on ourselves who represent them; and, if nobody else is moved to contrition, I believe we ought to be. I hope we *are;* and that before this distinguished body of the laity and clergy of our Church.

All that may be fairly urged by way of condoning, though not excusing, our defects—by which I mean the way we have fallen behind both the spirit and method of apostolic missions, and our old Anglo-Saxon evangelism—I must (for my brethren's sake, at least) not lose sight of. It will be observed that I make myself answerable chiefly for India and China. The languor and sickness induced by climate is a terrible foe to battle with. Proximity to England by rail and steamer; the comforts and refreshments of genial English society, in large stations especially, are of themselves sore temptations. Pastorates of small native flocks, and education work for children; studies of languages by which refined tastes are cultivated and gratified, and a certain degree of celebrity acquired; literary work for which attractive matter is ever ready to hand, and by which most flattering and agreeable access is obtained to literary and scientific circles; domestic duties as things now are, and needful attention bestowed on sick members of families; compiling of reports, ingeniously coloured rather than untruthful; balancing of statistics which are greedily sought for; watching the erection of mission buildings; correspondence with sympathising friends at home or abroad; duties for absent or invalided chaplains, or temporarily supplying the lack of a chaplain—these and a thousand other secondary and indirect agencies, παρεργα, readily grow into προεργα, things of primary importance; and, whilst in the beginning they pardonably occupy the leisure hours, they come at length too often to absorb the working hours of the missionary clergy. They may separately, or in their overpowering aggregate, harmonise with the idea of the missionary life in its ambiguous modern sense; but they sink the apostolate, nothing short of which can come up to the pregnant definition St. Paul gives of the true missionary: "*If our brethren be inquired of, they are the apostles of the Churches and the glory of Christ*"—that apostolate they sink to a low and commonplace level of *work*, if not of *aim*, which is more than sufficient, if I am not mistaken, to account for the delayed and disappointed expectations, and tardy answers to prayers, of those who sent them forth.

First and foremost, then, I would say that the missionary work of the Church of England in the nineteenth century, if it is to have results at all commensurate, under God, with the efforts put forth, and the expenditure and expectations raised, calls for the deepest contrition, humiliation, and genuine, heartfelt confession on the part of the labourers, for past neglects and defects; and, in the next place, for fervent cries and intercessions for large increase of apostolic gifts and graces to the Risen and Ascended Lord, who, "*When He ascended upon high, gave gifts to man—Himself gave apostles and prophets*"—a legacy of which the unclaimed residue is surely inexhaustible.

Must we not believe this apostolic spirit—if vouchsafed to larger numbers, if not in richer, fuller measure than heretofore—will manifest itself in a variety of practical ways and means, which I must not shrink from dwelling upon, though I shall offend many cherished prejudices and time-honoured practices, and repel some from the field who might not have flinched from a less exalted ideal. I am not afraid but that the sterner and loftier conception of the work will in the long run bring to the front more and better men of the true apostolic stamp and martyr spirit, to whom the work of the evangelist would have little

fascination were it not (as in the case of some few, I thank God, of our African, Indian, Chinese, North and South American labourers, *e.g.*, Gordon, Bruce, Selwyn, and Stier)—were it not, as in their case, a daily crucifixion, and "*bearing about in the body the dying of the Lord Jesus*" —a drinking deep of His cup, and being baptized with His baptism.

It would, too—if we may judge from what we know of the times and men when the Church won most glorious trophies for Christ, and put forth in ripe strength its apostolate to the nations—find among its children still larger bodies of men and women prepared to sacrifice the sweetness of domestic ties for the greater hardness and severity of discipline; the greater absence of comforts; the more habitual practice of retreats; stated times for united prayer (with fasting so far as climate allowed); and mutual provocation "to love and good works"; all of which characterise missionary brotherhoods and sisterhoods, like the brotherhoods of Delhi and Calcutta, the sisterhood at Murree, in the Punjab, from Warminster; but also, practically, though not in name and form, the band of deaconesses, whom we honour and love in the Lord more than I can say, at Amritsar and in its neighbouring towns and villages, with some few at Delhi, Kurnaul, and Roorkee—for here, too, are sisterhoods, to all intents and purposes—exhibiting that inimitably impressive and quietly influential force which comes of souls possessed by lowly love, purity, and singleheartedness of devotion.

It will be seen here that, in advocating the increase of brotherhoods and sisterhoods, I am not urging a celibate mission as the necessary or uniform condition of all high, courageous, and enterprising missionary effort; or as that which invariably achieves greater successes than the missionary who makes his home his starting point of effort. Some kinds, at least, of educational posts are as well served in the one state of life as in the other; but, where a moveable or "flying column" is needed to advance and occupy posts of special difficulty and jeopardy, as on the Afghan frontier, and in the heart of China, to go "*before the face of the Lord in the spirit and power of Elias*," "*to turn the hearts of the disobedient to the wisdom of the just*," and to set forth on such an errand disencumbered and unembarassed—here is a kind of missionary apostolate which we may devoutly pray, aye, and sanguinely expect, this nineteenth century of evangelical missions may see largely increased before the last sun of the year 1900 goes down; so that not even the Society of St. Vincent de Paul, or of Lacordaire and his great Dominican "Frères Prècheurs," may any more be emboldened to claim for their mission rolls, as they often do, an *unrivalled* continuous succession of saints, confessors and martyrs; that not even the historians of St. Hilda, St. Elfreda, and St. Ebba, of the 7th and 8th centuries, and of their large houses of missionary associates, with women of princely and royal blood at their head, shall be able to point the finger of scorn, reproach, or sorrowful rebuke at this century, and this our beloved Church and land, saying the while: "This age, and this reformed Church has never been able to produce such rich fruit as that." Why not some lady even of the Royal house;—or if England's needs, and those of our gracious Queen, cannot spare one of these to shed a radiant lustre of love and truth over some of the dark places at the utmost boundaries of our great empire—if not one of these, why not some few of the nobler, wealthier, and most refined women of our

land; most forceful in character, and sprung of the most ancient stock that can be found in our peerage rolls? Why should they not gather around them a little band of others poorer and less illustrious than themselves; and preside over such mission homes with a considerable degree of independence, and with the powers and functions of deaconesses entrusted to them by the Church and its bishops, to be exercised in some central cities of India, and in other British possessions and dependencies of our Crown?

Further, with this growth of the spirit of a true apostolate and high saintly consecration of priests to God and the Lamb; we are more hopeful that our Societies, and the Church whose loyal succourers they growingly have become and will be, will see their way to restrict themselves more to the financial support of missions abroad, and the circulation of select records of missionary labours, and the awakening of missionary zeal and sympathy—the home organisation, in fact, of the missions;—with friendly counsel, encouragement, and suggestions; leaving the selection of posts and assignment of men to some of the ablest and most experienced, the holiest and wisest, of our missionary veterans; in a manner not unlike those pursued with such admirable success by the various missionary orders in the Church of Rome? Those tried and practised veterans, of strongest character, most exemplary life, most self-sacrificing love (*homines idonei et digniores*) would act in consultation with the missionary bishops of our Indian and colonial Churches. Thus the elaborate intricacy of our often conflicting organisations would be avoided; as well as the necessity of messages passing across between committees at home and committees abroad: local committees and provincial committees, between which collisions must arise, and through collisions, procrastinations;—committees made up of men often of highly distinguished character, but whose interests and opinions must needs be divided; and the amount of information and experience gained must seriously vary, and the requisite promptness, decisiveness, and consistency of action not seldom be sacrificed, even where grave interests are at stake, causing anxiety and pain sometimes to the men who occupy the post of general oversight for Christ and His Church, and having a tendency to shelter incompetent and unfaithful agents. I venture to express my strong conviction that a change of organism such as that indicated above, and which would leave to the secretaries and committees several most important branches of work, while it would entrust to recognised leaders, men of commanding gifts and graces, as well as of varied lengthened experience, the distribution of available resources of men and means with reference to the ever fresh emergencies and altered conditions of the work;—will find favour eventually, and in some form or other be adopted, and will admit (with some little statesmanlike manipulating of details) of being harmonised with the action of our societies, which on a former occasion (the Missionary Conference in Oxford in 1877) I pleaded for as capable of fulfilling the same offices, and with like results, as the mission orders in the Church of Rome.

An apostolic spirit like this would further be led by the very instinct of its love and sympathy to be more painstaking than men ordinarily are in acquiring the mastery of the vernacular of the people or peoples embraced in its own line of labour; following this up, in the

case of a moderate capacity for languages, by honest, steady application to some Eastern classical tongue, as a means of gauging thought more accurately, by tracing language back to its roots, besides the enrichment and enlargement of vernacular idiom, and the power thus gained of arresting and attracting, with the aid of the good Spirit of God, the more educated and high-born.

The same spirit would lead to the adoption of what is the rarest method of what is called "itinerant preaching," yet the most recognised method and most constantly exemplified in the history of the Apostles—*i.e.*, neither on the one hand persistently and uninterruptedly residing in one town (of which apostolic missions supply few instances) and preaching the Gospel only there, and in the near neighbourhood; nor, on the other hand, passing in a discursive and desultory manner over a large extent of country, stopping one or two nights, preaching for some hours, and then passing on. Neither in the one method nor in the other, if one may judge from experience, is the largest success attained, the deepest impression made, and the sharpest suffering and peril encountered. The apostolic plan of evangelising appears to have differed from both. Their ordinary rule was to stay three, or six, or twelve months in large centres, and to preach steadily, with pointed directness, in plain yet loving exposure of popular superstitions and corruptions; in bold and clear setting forth of the Cross and the Resurrection, the new Creation by the Holy Ghost; the Kingdom, Power and Glory of the Son of Man and Son of God. This brought matters to a point. The strong man armed no longer held his goods in peace, even if not dispossessed of his stronghold. It was war to the knife. It was the writhing and close grappling of athlete with athlete, and, as a rule, one of two things happened, either the Apostle was maltreated, stoned and beaten, or at least rudely hustled in the crowd, as Mayer often is in the bazaars of Bunnoo, on the Wuzeeric frontier, as I saw it with my eyes last December; or threatened with the poison cup, and his inquirers bastinadoed, as was the case with the Apostolic Bruce, a few months since, when I visited his missions by request of the Church Missionary Society, and by commission from the Bishop of London;—or on the other hand, a Church was formed, and the Gospel took root, "*the planting of the Lord that He might be glorified.*" Doubtless this is the hardest and most perilous kind of preaching, and the most eminently Apostolic; though I am not prepared to deny that possibly the silent, secretly insinuating influence of Christian schools; the soaking and saturating of the mind, so to speak (when the catechising is at all of that masterly and soul-riveting kind from which the genius of the great Orleanese bishop, Dupanloup, reaped such unique results)—such influence may ultimately, in the long run, be equally efficacious in the saving and building up of souls; only the results are more imperceptibly gradual and less striking and impressive.

If in the line taken I have thought and judged aright, then the most urgent need, and the thing to be pleaded for with most piercing cry is, "apostles, apostolic men and women," with some measure of independent action conceded to them, as I stated above. Few or many is not so much the question as, are they apostles? and beneath whose records of labour might be written the words, in true though humble and feeble imitation of the Apostle Paul's inspired challenge: "*Am I not an*

Apostle? Am I not free? Have I not seen Christ Jesus the Lord? Are not ye my work in the Lord? If I am not an Apostle to others, yet doubtless I am to you, for the seal of my Apostleship are ye in the Lord"?

I spoke of apostolic women; and with good warrant, surely. Junia as well as Andronicus were "of note among the apostles." And five or six such I have known in Amritsar and the neighbourhood, one of whom passed away a year ago in the heart of the Kulu jungles, whither she had gone (with her husband, a son of the late Bishop of Carlisle) to lead her Indian sisters by the hand to Christ, marked, as we all felt, with the clearest prints of saintliness which the Church below could look to see exhibited in its members. Another, a young native lady of great talent and refinement, and gentlest piety. Another whom I dare not do more than designate by her sobriquet of A.L.O.E., who, besides translations of her own works in the vernacular, for a whole year, in the absence of the missionary in charge, presided over a Christian native boarding school of forty boys; with incessant visits, and hard and patient instructions, ministered to the women of many, many Indian homes. Another who spends many hours daily in teaching and watching over some six hundred girls and young married women, chiefly of the Sikh race, our noble allies in the Delhi siege and capture, as well as in Abyssinia and Egypt. Another (a fresh young worker of the Normal School Society), I found struggling patiently and successfuly at Ispahan, by Mrs. Bruce's side, and with her help, in mastering the special difficulties of the Armenian and Persian tongue. Another in Amritsar nobly representing those medical missions which have been singularly helpful in feeding and illustrating apostolic graces. Other some there are like these, of whom the utmost I could say would be less than the truth; the least I could say would be displeasing to themselves; so I forbear. Their witness is on high. "Some men's sins go before them to judgment. *They that are otherwise cannot be hid.*"

Deeply thankful, then, as we are for our *Apostolicity* and *Catholicity* (as a Church), I would yet pray you, Brethren and Fathers in Christ, to plead for a larger *apostolate* in the mission field. *Truer*, I trust, we need not ask; but *larger* we do need of labourers approving their apostolicity in love, purity, power, poverty and devotedness. I include *poverty*, because almost all national movements, I believe, towards Christ and the Gospel of the Kingdom have had their rise in the life and labour of men of poverty and hardness, as well as of saintliness and power. Is it not such men we do eminently need to consecrate and set on a Christian basis philosophy, science, literature, of which things such an insatiable thirst consumes many of the young men of India? Poverty and purity combined are, in theory at least, allied to all their traditional methods of teaching. It happened only last year at a famous religious fair in India, that the Brahmins, seeing some Christian preachers, whom I confirmed two years since, clothed in the usual yellow robe of the native ascetic, exclaimed with a bitter cry, "Alas! the Christians have at length got entrance into our last stronghold!" Yet, more than poverty, we need men of apostolic constancy, that stick tenaciously to their post of labour; and this, because the Holy Ghost has said "Separate me Barnabas and Saul." And along with this separation to Himself, HE has inspired them for the work, by giving them an original and independent revelation of the mysteries of the faith with the heavenly forces,

"*the powers of the world to come*," thereto attached. As St. Paul expresses it. "*It pleased God to reveal his Son in me, that I might preach HIM among the Gentiles.*" To such gifted men it is given to animate and inspire others. "All genius" says Godet, the great professor of Neufchatel, "all genius (and may we not add 'all strong and unfaltering faith,') seems to possess the gift of electrifying its age, and calling into being a multitude of talents of a nature akin to itself. The great personality of Solomon (the wise man *par excellence*) soon found itself surrounded by a kind of college of thinkers, who were the ornament of his court, who shared his high aims and noble labours." *Biblical Studies*, page 188.

Is our impoverishment in respect of these great gifts—the scarcity and rarity of them, I mean—to be charged upon the Church of England? or is it that we, the missionaries in India and China, must bear the charge of not exhibiting that apostolic spirit which attracts fellow workers, as the men of our University Central African Missions (and of the C.M.S. to some extent) have singularly called forth comrades of a high and heroic order? Ought we not frankly to confess this, if indeed it be so? Does not truth require it of us? Is it not a deep debt we owe to Christ and His Church?

I confess to having been deeply distressed, whenever I have appealed to the leaders of mind and spirit at Oxford and Cambridge, as well as London, for men of the stamp of Martyn, Corrie, and Thomason, whom Mr. Simeon sent forth in comparative numbers, at the refusal from so many scores of men to cast in their lot with us, especially from men of ability, learning, and high character, who, as chaplains, might help with the Delhi Brotherhood in watching and turning to good account the educational wave passing over North India, and in wiping off the reproach cast upon us as a missionary church in a remarkable letter I had some months since from a learned Moollah at Patna, that we so jealously and heartlessly have kept, and do keep, under lock and key, untranslated and unimparted, the vast stores of theological literature, patristic and other, which the English Church possessed.

It must be admitted that our colonial bishoprics in Africa and Australia, and such men as those of Wilson, Milman, Douglas, and not a few others, are a redeeming feature for which we may give God praise. Yet, with bright exceptions, we dare not maintain that in the matter of fulfilling its duty to the heathen world the Church of England is in its right position; or "*is full of power by the SPIRIT of the Lord*" to do the "*priestly work of offering*" (Rom. xv. 16) up the heathen world to God; or that the proportion of our clergy is materially growing to whom the modern history of the Church is known, so as to be able (in the absence of missionaries on furlough, or district secretaries, pledged to act in their room), to give, in Church gatherings for missionary purposes, a consecutive and lively history of a particular mission from notes culled out of past records of missionary bodies.

Pardon me this digression, Brethren in Christ—a digression of the heart which will perforce speak itself out upon occasion offered.

To return to the main point in hand—we would once more say, "Let us pray the Lord of the Harvest to send forth labourers," *apostles*—which is our present need: to send them forth as the ripened fruit, not only of our University Course, and Theological College,

training at home; but also of our theological colleges at Lahore, Delhi, Allahabad, Osaki, and others. In regard to one of these labourers, Imadooddeen by name, a letter from my brother, Mr. Robert Clark, reached me to-day, begging that an humble representation may be made to His Grace the Archbishop, requesting, on the part of the whole body of the Punjab missionaries, that in consideration of his very distinguished services as a preacher and a writer of works of Christian evidence, he may see fit to confer on him the degree of D.D. Another is Junior Professor of Greek and Hebrew at our Divinity College at Lahore. Another is so great a Sanskrit scholar that not very long ago he begged me to take the chair on the occasion of his reading out before the assembled Hindoos of the town in which he lived a Sanskrit essay in explanation of the reasons which had led him after long and painstaking search to embrace the Gospel of Christ. Another sent forth by Mr. Hughes, and the native Church of Peshawer, went from them last year, at much peril of his life, to preach the Word of Life among some heathen tribes in Karferistan. This was an Afghan student. Such signs of an apostle wrought in any of these we hail and devoutly thank God for. May it please the Blessed Spirit to separate more such to Himself from these students, as well as from amongst the most highly gifted, the most learned of our brethren at home.

Be it ours, on our knees in our closets, and in the presence and with the co-operation of our flocks, to weigh seriously the heavy responsibility attaching to us as a branch of the Catholic Church of Christ, "*built on the foundation of Apostles and Prophets*," having a great deposit handed down to us from the days of St. Aiden, St. Boniface, St. Anschar, and others; a debt for whose faithful discharge we are accountable to the Church of God, and to the Church's great HEAD and HIGH PRIEST, the King and Saviour of Men!

Sir William Muir, K.C.S.I., LL.D., D.C.L.

I FEEL it an honour and a pleasure to follow my dear friend the Bishop of Lahore, whom I welcomed to Agra thirty years ago. My only regret is that in the bishop's presence my lips are sealed, and I am debarred from setting him forward as an example in life and doctrine of a true Messenger of Christ in foreign parts. For nearly forty years I had the privilege of close and intimate acquaintance with missionary work in India. But before turning to India, I would ask what, throughout the world, the Church is doing to fulfil her Lord's command to make the Gospel known to the uttermost parts of the earth? Many things that Bishop French has said are of weighty import, but I hardly agree with him that the imperfect success is owing to defective system. In my humble opinion it is not the *methods* of our missionaries that are at fault, but the *utter inadequacy of their numbers*. Look at Central Asia, and Central Africa, with their vast and thickly-populated countries, left in gross darkness, or with but here and there a glimmer making the darkness all the deeper. What, again, are we doing in that great and open field of Persia? At most but one or two missionaries for the whole people. Arabia is left untouched. The Northern shores of Africa—once noble Sees under a Cyprian and an Augustine, afterwards swallowed up in the Saracen invasion, and now once again open to us through European influence—are

equally neglected. So, too, with Cyprus and Egypt, gotten, as we are wont to say, with "Peace and Honour;" but there is no peace or honour to the Church when we obtain a kingdom and leave it without the message of peace from the King of heaven. Surely it is time for the Church to arise and shine, for her light has come, and the glory of the Lord has risen upon her. But it may be said that, at any rate, in India we are doing our duty. Much, no doubt, is doing there. But even in India, the Evangelistic agencies are few and far apart, a station here with a missionary or two, and a station there, perhaps a hundred miles or more distant, with seething millions of the heathen utterly untouched between. And yet the effect produced in India by our missions is little short of marvellous. I refer chiefly to the indirect and leavening influences of Christianity throughout the land. You have heard of the Brahma Somâj. I do not, indeed, look for any immediate movement towards Christianity from that body; for they do not hold the distinctive and saving doctrines of our faith, or hold them only in a mystic and eclectic form, in common with the teaching of other creeds. But still the members of the Somâj bear a noble testimony to the dominant influence of the religion of Jesus in India. One of them, a Hindoo gentleman, speaking recently to the students of the Chittagong College said :—

"Great Britain is all glorious within, because she has put on Christ, the glorious image of God. The Spirit of the Son of God has elevated and glorified her. Nothing shall be able to separate her from the love of her dear Lord. God has destined her to shine and grow in the glory of His dear Son, Christ. It is her Christian piety that inspires her to die to self and to live only to glorify God. May India learn the true secret of Britain's glory, and grow wiser thereby! May India soon emerge from the terrible deadness of her vile self-worship, and live to glorify God, and God only."

And the leader of the movement, Keshub Chunder Sen, in his annual addresses at the Town Hall of Calcutta, crowded with natives, gave reiterated and grateful evidence of the grand work that missions are performing. I will quote but one or two sentences from his addresses :—

"The success of Christian missions is no longer a problem. For myself I can say I feel no misgivings. I fully believe Christ has come into India and has taken possession of India's heart. Some say India *will* be Christ's, but is not yet. I hate the idea of conjugating Christ's success in India in the future tense. It is a thing already achieved. When a native of India bears testimony, let not foreigners dispute it. I say emphatically that the Spirit of Christ has gone into the depths of India's heart. . . . I declare that the sanctifying and civilising influences of Christ's life and teachings is working wonders in this land."

And again, speaking of the Atonement :—

"And so He offered Himself before God as an atonement for all mankind. *Atonement* did I say? What a startling announcement you would think I have made before this great assembly. Yes, I believe in Christ's atonement. All India must believe that Christ is the Son of God. Nay, more than this, I will make myself bold enough to prophesy: India will one day acknowledge Jesus Christ as the atonement, the Universal Atonement for all mankind."

When such sentiments as these are applauded by an assembly of two thousand Hindoos, can we say that missions have been without effect, or that the way is not being opened up for the favourable reception of our faith?

Coming now to the direct results of Christian missions in India, I say that they are not to be despised. Thousands have been brought over, and in an ever increasing ratio, converts are being brought over, to Christianity. And they are not shams nor paper converts, as some would have us believe, but good and honest Christians, and many of them of a high standard. I will mention but three names, as types of the various classes of our converts. There was Gopee

Nath Nundy, one of Dr. Duff's elèves, whom I knew well as a missionary at Futtehpore. This man was seized in 1857 by the mutinous cavalry, and carried, in company with a young English officer, to the head quarters of the rebels at Allahabad. There he not only himself braved the sword of the mutineers, who would have had him apostatise, but encouraged his young companion also to remain firm. And there have been many such confessors. Then, as an example of purity in political life, we have Pundit Ram Chunder, a mathematician of some renown, who was tutor and director of public instruction to a Rajah, and who, amid all the intrigues of an Oriental Durbar, held himself so upright and innocent, that the Political Officer under whom he served styled him the Daniel of his time. The last time that I saw Ram Chunder was when he accompanied his chief to Calcutta on the visit of the Prince of Wales. He was on that occasion dismissed from his post; but for what? for no other reason than expostulating against a course of excess and intemperance. Then of the quieter Christian life I would instance my dear friend David Mohun, the pastor of the Christian village at Allahabad—a community itself that will compare to advantage with any similar community at home, and presided over with wisdom and devotion by Mohun, who can take his turn when required with the English clergy in ministering to the devotions of the European residents. Of such converts we may well glory, as the work of the Spirit, and the joy and crown of the Churches, and there are many of them. In speaking of our own missions, we should not forget the noble work which the American brethren are doing for us. The Presbyterian missions, and the "American Methodist Episcopal" missions, are left thankfully by the English in undisturbed possession of great cities and large provinces, the field being ample for all, and the spirit of brotherly love prevailing. And we owe them a debt of gratitude for their missionary and Evangelistic help.

Again, we must never forget the effect which our missions have upon the European populations settled abroad, by maintaining in them a wholesome attitude towards the heathen faiths around. If Christianity is anything, it must be everything. It cannot brook a rival, nor cease to wage war against all other faiths, without losing its strength and virtue. If those faiths are left intact, the sentiment must surely gain ground that, while Christianity may be best for the European, these other faiths are quite sufficient for the people professing them. The professors of a Christianity which is thus put on a par with the surrounding faiths soon become indifferent, and fall to the level of the people among whom they dwell. It is missionary effort alone that restores Christianity to the throne; and it is missionary effort more than anything else that has raised the morale of our countrymen in India. Many a young man has had to bless God for giving him an interest in missions, and many a young lady for interest in Zenana work. In watering others they have themselves been watered.

Lastly, I would say a word on the influence of Foreign Missions on the Church at home. Next to the work at our own doors, there is nothing that reacts more in reviving the Churches, and giving them spiritual life and energy. It is then that the Church has the true ring of Apostolic succession. After "the form of sound words," and "beginning at Jerusalem," there is no more certain sign of a Church bearing the Apostolic stamp than this, of being scattered abroad everywhere, fulfilling the Master's command. For what were His parting words?

"Then opened He their understanding, that they might understand the Scriptures; and said unto them, Thus it is written, and thus it behoved Christ to suffer, and to rise from the dead the third day; and that repentance and remission of sins should be preached in His Name *among all nations*, beginning at Jerusalem; and ye are witnesses of these things."

And just as He was about to ascend to the right hand of the Father :—

"But ye shall receive power, after that the Holy Ghost is come upon you. And ye shall be witnesses unto Me, both in Jerusalem and in all Judæa, and in all Samaria, *and unto the uttermost part of the earth.*"

So, then, in proportion as our understandings are opened to understand the Scriptures, in so far as we know Christ in the fellowship of His sufferings and in the power of His resurrection, and in the degree in which we "receive power" from the pentecostal outpouring of the Spirit, in that same proportion shall we strive to preach the Gospel "among all nations," and be the witnesses of Jesus "to the uttermost part of the earth." So long as the Church can send forth men like Martyn and Fox, Patteson and Selwyn ; men like French, and his worthy Indian coadjutor Stuart, of Wyapoo ; like Duff and Wilson, Carey, Livingstone, and the veteran who has just passed away, the aged Moffat, so long the Church need not fear—only, to answer her Lord's command, the numbers must be vastly multiplied. Indeed, we are compassed about with a cloud of witnesses. But we must never forget that it is not only the example of those who have gone before, "the noble army, men and boys, the matron and the maid," which we must set before us, but a yet higher, the example set us by Him who came on the mission to seek and to save them that were lost. And it is just in proportion as that mind is in the Church, which mind was also in Christ Jesus, that the Church will gird up her loins and go forth to the uttermost parts of the earth on the same Divine errand which brought her Master down from above, on His mission of grace and mercy to lost mankind.

The Ven. ARCHIDEACON FARLER, Pampisford Vicarage, Cambridge.

As my work has laid principally in Central Africa, I shall confine myself, in the remarks I am about to make, to missionary efforts among barbarous races. There must necessarily be some difference in the *modus operandi* of missions to semi-civilised races possessing a literature and a civilisation of their own, like the Chinese, and the Hindus ; and to barbarous races sunk into a low materialism, without any definite faith, such as the numberless tribes of Central Africa. In the one, we find a code of morality of some sort, imperfect indeed, but usually far superior to the practice, to which our missionaries can appeal, and so arouse the slumbering conscience of their hearers. But, in the other, the conscience seems dead, and there is no standard of morality known to the barbarian to which an appeal can be made. He does not feel the need of God, he does not desire any revelation of Him, he is utterly indifferent to spiritual things ; and as he has no sense of sin as we understand sin, it is useless at first to preach to him of a Saviour from sin. Man has been called a hopeless puzzle, and nowhere does this dictum seem truer than in first dealing with the African mind, which is full of puzzles. A missionary in Africa has much preparatory work before he can preach Christ to the uncivilised heathen. After winning their love and respect, his first work is to revive the conscience in the hearts of his people, to try and convince them of sin, and to make them feel that sin is a rebellion against the majesty of God —the missionary must, in fact, follow the plan adopted by God in His dealings with the human race—he must teach the Law before preaching the Gospel. Christianity must first create the want of a Saviour, and then supply that want, by preaching in all its fulness the glorious Gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ. Conversion, in the Christian sense, is not going over from one theory to another—it is a new life. This

is the difficulty the Christian Missionary has to contend with in meeting the Moslem. The heathen who embraces Islam has only to accept a formula, to keep a few simple rules as to food and drink, *and then without any change of heart or life*, he enters a great religious freemasonry, extending throughout India, Western Asia, and Northern and Eastern Africa, so that wherever his business takes him he finds a welcome as one of the faithful. In adopting this new faith, he confesses the great central truth of all religion—the unity of God—he attains a certain dignity as a member of a wide and powerful caste, and he has to give up little or nothing that the natural man craves for. He retains all his heathen vices, except, perhaps, drunkenness, and most of his heathen practices, for Islam gives him every indulgence, and no voice of conscience is aroused by it to warn him of the wrath of God. He is ever taught that a true Mussulman cannot be lost whatever his life may be, for "God is merciful," and if he carefully performs the sala or ritual prayers, and his religious ablutions, all his sins are by these outward acts washed away, for sin is only a physical impurity. His life then is just what it was before, and this is the reason why Islam so commends itself to the African mind. While giving him much self-respect, a sense of superiority over the heathen around, and making him member of a great brotherhood, it still leaves him free to follow his own natural lusts. The convert to Christianity, however, has to change most of his social habits, he has to give up much that he holds dear, especially the putting away of all his wives but one; this is a great difficulty, and where there are children, it is full of problems. He must cast off his charms in which he has trusted from childhood, cease to fear the spirits which his ancestors worshipped, absent himself from the sacrifices to the manes of his departed relatives, and, therefore, be called unfilial by his friends. He must curb his natural lusts, and live a pure God-fearing life, and while not bidden to free his slaves, he is urged to do so. In fact, he must become a new creature in Jesus Christ. Thus the Christian missionary has not only to build up the supernatural life in his converts, but he has to create a new social life. A native, in becoming a Christian, does not find a great brotherhood ready to receive him, and ready to supply all that he loses as a convert to Islam does; but, until a mission is well established, he finds only a few foreigners to welcome him, whose ways of life and modes of thought are very different from his own, and he has to undergo great contumely at the hands of his friends and relations, for giving up the "desturi," or customs of his country. The missionary must form a society to supply the loss of his dearest earthly interests. It has been a question whether Islam can in any way be considered as a step towards Christianity, and, I believe, most missionaries have been obliged to answer it in the negative. I have, however, found in East Central Africa, that Islam is in some ways a preparation for Christianity, in that it raises the natives who accept it out of their dead cold materialism, and teaches them that there is a God, who shall judge the world, that there is a future life, either of happiness or woe, depending upon certain actions done in this life, so that some of our most earnest and intelligent Christians are converts from Islam. But then, at Magila, we have a strong central station, where the Church is set before the heathen in her glory and beauty, and where her services are rendered with great solemnity and reverence. Our solemn processions, our glad hymns and litanies, attract even the Moslem, and make him desire to know more of a faith, so beautiful in its worship, a faith which, like his own, confesses but one God, but, unlike his own, preaches one mediator between God and man—the Man Christ Jesus. He sees the social life of the new converts so vigorous and complete, the arts of civilised life are carried on for the welfare of the people, and the divine art of healing is freely dispensed to all who need it. It is a new world to him, complete in itself, which attracts him, and makes him long to enter it. The lesson I have learned, and which I would

impress upon the Church at home, is, that if we would convert the uncivilised races of earth to Christ, we must go back and follow more closely in the footsteps of the great missionaries of old. We must take, as our pattern, the missions of St. Augustine, St. Boniface, and St. Columba; we must not send out solitary missionaries to wear out their hearts, and die far away from all Christian aid and sympathy; and, as a family settlement seems in Central Africa an impossibility at present, we must fall back upon Brotherhoods and Sisterhoods—artificial families. To each tribe, then, let the Church send a complete community of bishop and clergy, with lay-brothers as artisans, to teach the people the arts of civilised life. A Christian mission in a barbarous land should be as complete as a Christian community in England. Let the mission be established in the centre of the country, with the semblance of strength which is the germ of law, not only with the priest to minister to souls, but also with the doctor to minister to bodies, and the carpenter, builder, and other missionary artisans to teach their trades, so that when the natives see our deeds, they may believe our words. Where possible, let there be attached to the mission, a community of holy women, who shall set before the people patterns of the devout life, and, by the aid of the Holy Spirit, bring mercy, truth, and love, into the very homes of the heathen; we should then no more hear of the failure of missions. As in the olden days, the castle was the germ of the town, so now history must repeat itself, and the mission station must be the germ of the Christian Commonwealth, and where there is no law but the will of the strongest, for the chiefs have generally but little power, Christianity must step in to denounce wrong and injustice. But, it may be asked, Where are you to find all these missionary artisans? The Church of Rome has solved the problem in her missions, for I have seen in Africa, the lay-brother, who has been taught a trade, working at the forge, or in the carpenter's shop, or standing upon the scaffolding of some new building, directing the native workmen. Shall the Church of England, in these days of her strength and mighty revival, fail to do the same? No! For as I walk through the streets of our towns, or go into our workhouses, I see the raw material running to waste on every side. I would ask young men of wealth, who are seeking for some vocation in life, and our cathedral chapters, to do this most necessary work for us. Let there be founded in every diocese, a Diocesan Home, into which the waifs and strays of our modern social life may be gathered, and trained in the love and fear of God, and where they may be taught the various arts useful in uncivilised lands, and then, at length, with the blessing of their bishop, united in the bands of a common brotherhood, let them go forth to work for God in heathen lands. Many a parish priest must know of some orphan, or desolate boy, whom he would gladly place in such a home; and what a blessing it would be to this country to prevent such poor children growing up to swell the ranks of our criminals, and to work for the devil. Here they would be enlisted in the army of God, to work for Him, to win souls for Him; and, how eagerly would our missionary and colonial bishops welcome such a band of trained lay-brothers.

The Rev. W. Townsend Storrs.

The only claim I have to address the Congress on this subject is that I spent fifteen years in India, and for the last ten or eleven years I have been a beneficed clergyman at home, so that I know the needs of the Church both at home and abroad,

so far as missionary work is concerned. I think that the great need still lies at home, and that the need is rather of more faith in the Church at home than of more apostolic men abroad. That is the great want—more faith in the spirit and the power of God to convert; more faith in the Cross of Christ to draw men's hearts, and more faith in the men we send out as the messengers of the Churches and the glory of Christ. In fact, it is as our Lord said, "According to your faith, be it unto you." Then let the Church at home take its share of the blame of this apparent want of success in missionary work; and with more faith we shall have another need supplied, that of more sympathy with those who are working abroad. Having been for some time a deputation for the Church Missionary Society, I know that some amongst those who ought to be the leaders of the Church in these matters are terribly deficient in real sympathy with missions. It is true that most of the clergy "patronise" one of the two Church Mission Societies, but when they give their pulpits for missions they often do not give their hearts with them. I believe that many a man would refuse his pulpit altogether if he dared to do so. There are clergy who still would refuse were there no public opinion on the matter; and who, if they lend their pulpits for "a Missionary Sunday," take the opportunity of slipping away and of having a holiday. The Church at home also is far too exacting as regards reports. I believe that these reports often spoil the whole work, and that the souls of the missionaries are injured more even than their work is hindered by having to draw them up. Reports seldom bring God's blessing, and they often drive it away. I say, then, that if you must have reports (and they may be necessary), let the bishop, or the Society's Corresponding Secretary, make the reports, as having been eye-witnesses of the work. It is a degradation of the work, and an injury to the worker, to have to report upon his own efforts. These reports are a temptation to the missionary to make the best of things, instead of writing what is the real condition of his mission. I should like to know what would be the effect if the home clergy were called upon to write reports of their own work. They would inevitably feel that they were puffing themselves rather than glorifying God. It is the same with the mission clergy; if they do a great work, it is the work of God, and not their doing, although they are the humble instruments in His hands. Bishop French has anticipated much that I would have said, but one thing it is very necessary to say. We need not go back to the time of St. Boniface or St. Augustine, but let us go back to the plans adopted by the apostles themselves. It is not mediæval, but apostolic plans we need. In the time of the early Church, missionaries were never sent out alone, and St. Paul even needed a Silas or Timotheus to go with him. Missionaries needed the assistance and comfort of a brother missionary. No missionary should ever be placed or left alone, even though we have no need of brotherhoods. I think we have far too much of the mission station system. Men are put down at a mission station and left there for years; but we do not work on the apostolic model: that was to move from one place to another, staying a year or two here, and a few months there. By the station system, money is spent in providing comfortable, and even palatial, homes for the missionaries. I say, give the missionary every comfort he needs for his work, but do not make him a stationary being; let him feel that he is part of an expeditionary force, not of an army in barracks. The frittering away of time in rapid and fruitless itineration is one of the natural results of the station system. We do not want so much of the bishop, priest, and deacon among missionaries; we want the restoration of the ancient order of evangelists both at home and abroad. For why should we ignore the apostolic order of evangelists? Missionaries ought to be not so much priests as evangelists. They need not even be ordained as priests, but, having formed their Christian congregations from the

heathen, then from those congregations let men be chosen as priests and deacons to have charge of the church. Let me, in conclusion, appeal to you on behalf of the aboriginal races of India. All the great mass of converts in India have come from the aboriginal races, or those of aboriginal descent; and if the Church had been more alive to her duty, thousands more of these people would have been gathered in; for the great conquests of Christianity have never been amongst the educated and rich, but rather amongst the poor and despised. Now—nay, one is tempted to say, now or never—is our time of work among them; for if not Christianised, the only future that lies before them is to be absorbed among the low-caste Hindus; and who can say that low-caste Hindus, with their debasement, prejudice, and immorality, are as hopeful a field for missions as the noble aboriginal races?

DISCUSSION.

The Rev. SIDNEY PHILLIPS, Secretary to the Bishop of Capetown, and to the Central Agency for Foreign Missions; Rector of Nuneham Courtenay.

HAVING the charge of a small country parish, I have more leisure than many of my brethren to give to mission work, and, consequently, have undertaken, conjointly with his brother, to act as secretary to the Bishop of Capetown; and I have also been in some measure instrumental in opening the Central Agency for special funds. I shall be glad of the opportunity this evening of saying a few words on the Church in South Africa, and also concerning the Central Agency. First, with regard to the Central Agency, I may say distinctly that those persons who are responsible for its existence, have from the first been opposed to the creation of a new society. The only work that the Central Agency at present undertakes is to remit such offerings as may be sent for our colonial and missionary bishops, and the clergy working in their dioceses, which can no longer be paid through the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel. The Central Agency is merely an office to receive money for any particular mission or diocese abroad, and nothing more. It has the sanction of the Archbishop of Canterbury, the Bishops of Durham, Carlisle, Oxford, Exeter, and Truro. During this year we have, up to the present time, only had £1,000 sent to us for various special funds, but we attribute this in a great measure to the fact that at present the existence of the office is but little known. We hope that when the agency is more widely known by the supporters of foreign missions, we shall receive much larger sums; but, let me add, we shall gladly close the office directly the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel is ready to receive special funds again. With regard to the Church in South Africa, I am anxious to say a few words concerning the present crisis in the Diocese of Maritzburg, as a letter of mine which appeared in the *Guardian* a few weeks since, has been misunderstood by the people in South Africa, and the Bishop of Maritzburg has in consequence written to me in reply. It is a very kind letter, in which he speaks with great confidence of the condition of his diocese, and in a way which I am sure will give great satisfaction to many people in this room. I will read the following extract. The bishop says: "I have just returned from the consecration of the Coadjutor Bishop of St. John's, to find the cheering tokens of the *approchement* on the part of the better disposed amongst the Colenso party, one of the clergy (they are but seven in all) having already come over and awaiting 'reconciliation,' and two more having made overtures." I have also received by this morning's post, from South Africa, a copy of a letter which the Bishop of Maritzburg has recently addressed to the members of the so-called Church of England, in Natal, which will, I feel sure, be read with great interest when it is published in England. In this letter, the bishop clearly shows that "the Church in the Colonies has no access to the ecclesiastical courts of the mother country;" that "the action of the Church in the establishment of a system of synods, and the framing of a constitution, not in South Africa alone, but in Canada, Australia, New Zealand, and elsewhere, was forced upon her by the discovery that without such organisation she was practically without law."

The Bishop says further : " I do not, of course, presume to assert that the Constitution of the South African Church is in all respects perfect, or incapable of improvement. But I do claim for it that it is an honest endeavour—undertaken, as we have seen, not as a self-chosen task, but as a burden imposed by the inexorable hand of the Civil Power, yet undertaken in prayerful reliance upon the Divine guidance, and after counsel taken with some of the ablest and most learned Churchmen in England and the Colonies—to frame such a suggestion as, while allowing the largest amount of true liberty to all its members, affords at the same time the means for close and enduring union in faith, doctrine, and discipline with the venerated Church of our forefathers." I regret that time will not allow me to read the concluding portion of this letter, which contains an earnest appeal to examine the true position of the Church in South Africa, and a longing for unity. I will only say, in conclusion, that it does seem to me, that while we are deploring the divisions of South Africa, we must not forget how much we are wanting in unity at home in missionary work. We want more prayer and less begging. If we could only get people to pray more for missions, I am sure that the necessary money would very soon be forthcoming. Why should missionary sermons be confined to two or three Sundays in the year? We ought to bring the cause of missions before our people at least once every month. And then we need more men. It is a matter of surprise that so few of our best men in this country—men who have been educated at our great public schools and Universities—and who do not know where to look for employment, should not be ready to give themselves up to the work of the Church abroad for the love of souls, and be found willing to "spend themselves, and be spent" in the service of our Lord and Master Jesus Christ. Then, I would ask, why do not people who cannot go out themselves to missions abroad, take a more active interest in the work of training men for mission work at home? Why have we not many more missionary colleges? and why is not a more general support given to those which already exist? In this diocese, I would mention the Missionary College of Dorchester, which well merits our fullest sympathy and support. A good work is being done there, where men are not only receiving a sound theological training, but where they also have some medical training, which must be of great use to missionaries in their work. Above all, let us all have more faith in the abiding Presence of our Lord and Master, and remember that He has entrusted to us the work of saving souls, that we must each one of us do what we can for Him, and that we shall all have to give an account to Him of the way in which we have discharged that portion of the work, which He in His Love and Mercy has assigned to us.

General R. Maclagan, R.E.

There are two points suggested by what we have just heard, on which I should like to make a few remarks,—the Bishop of Lahore has spoken of the slow progress of missions in some parts of India, and he referred to this, as he said, with some reluctance or regret, as he appeared thereby to be, in some measure, condemning others and himself. Speaking from the laymen's side, as one who has been long residing in the midst of the missions to which the bishop belonged, I wish to say that we should not be disposed to take this view, and that, certainly, we could not find cause for looking in this manner on the labours of the men who are working in those missions, whatever may be the amount of success that is alluded to. The work, as Mr. Storrs has said, is a work of faith. We are all familar with the form in which this truth is often put, that our duty is to carry the work on, whatever success or want of success may attend it, and leave results to God. This is true, but it does not mean that we are to rest content. It is right that our methods of work should be fully examined, that such plans may be adopted as seem suitable to the circumstances. Such methods as those which the Bishop has mentioned, and the others which the experience of Archdeacon Farler in another country has brought to our notice, should receive due consideration, as possibly helpful in some cases to the object in view. Among the arrangements of mission work which have been the subject of difference of opinion, is one referred to by Mr. Storrs, who observed, with regard to it, that he could wish the term mission *station* were abolished. He believes it would be better that the missionaries should remain only a short time at any place, and then move on to another. Without entering into any discussion of the question, I merely bring to

notice the opposite view held by others, that in some countries at least more may be done by strong, concentrated, permanent missions at important centres. Again, the success in past years of missions among the simple hill tribes of India, and the lower classes of the people, has been mentioned as a reason for directing attention chiefly to those classes. The very fact here noticed, however, is the ground on which the necessity of the other course is pressed, the necessity, namely, of now directing our efforts more to the higher classes. The successes of missions among people of the rude tribes, or of low position, are not undervalued when it is said that there is something of more value in gaining even a few of the people of higher social and intellectual standing. There are many people in India ready to look on Christianity as something just suited for these low classes, if it is chiefly by them it is accepted, and to them we continue to present it, and this idea does not commend it to others. But, happily, we can point now to not a few men in India, men of education, men of learning and of good position, who are also eminent and earnest Christians, and some of them ordained pastors of the native Church. The second point I desired to notice is the importance, in connection with our missions to the people of India, of due care for the moral and spiritual welfare of our own countrymen there. It is well known that during the last quarter of a century the number of English people in India has very largely increased. They are dispersed through different parts of the country, employed in connection with the railways and other public works, as well as with various commercial concerns and works of private enterprise. Their condition affects our efforts on behalf of the natives. The oldest missionary society of the Church of England, the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel, at its commencement made the care of our countrymen in the British Colonies and dependencies its first concern. England needs to do something now in the same way for those English people in India who have not the means of providing for themselvs; not on their own account merely, but with reference to the missions to the people around them. It is probably known to many here present that certain questions relating to proposed legislation in India have lately been causing much agitation in that country and in this. I am not going to introduce the discussion of any such questions at a Church Congress meeting, but I wish to observe, that as they directly concern the mutual relations of the natives and the English people dwelling among them, we must greatly desire that these relations should, on the English side, be of a wholesome kind. To our missions in India the English people there may be either a help or a hindrance. A high standard of life among our fellow-countrymen in India will be a strong and growing support of our missions to the natives.

The Right Rev. J. MITCHINSON, D.C.L., Assistant Bishop in the Diocese of Peterborough.

ASSUMING, as I suppose I may do, that the term *Missions* includes Church extension in the Colonies, I desire to offer one, or, if time permits, two simple suggestions, of the practicability of which others must judge. First and foremost, with reference to the supply of men. "More recruits," is the constant outcry of the missionary societies —more urgent even than the cry for ampler means. It is the dearth of men, more, perhaps, than anything, which led us to the adoption, as an annual institute of the Church, of the Day of Intercession for missions. I confess I often wince under this holy-day as it recurs. Not that I deprecate prayer as an essential factor in missionary success. God forbid! I would that we had incorporated as a Collect in our daily Office, and as a suffrage in our Litany, a supplication for God's blessing on our mission efforts. But it is because I have learned to fear that the Day of Intercession for missions is an unreality on the part of the Church of England as a Church. The Church, as a whole, is not sincere in her professed enthusiasm and eagerness for missions and their well-being; for she is asking God to do for her what she is not taking the obvious and reasonable means to carry into effect herself, and we have no right to ask God to interpose to effect for us what we could achieve (under His blessing and guidance) with well-directed effort of our own. Why, then, is there this dearth of volunteers, where fields of work are so numerous, and, to a fairly earnest man, so attractive? Because we expect more of these volunteers for exceptionally arduous and self-denying service than we dream of expecting from any other

department of our Church work. We demand life-long service in one sphere of labour, or we tacitly or avowedly regard as failures or faint-hearts those who decline or find themselves unable so to regard it. Hence it is that at present men go out to mission or colonial work only from the very highest or (I fear I must say) the very lowest motives; either because they are impelled by a noble self-devotion to consecrate great talents, and sacrifice more brilliant prospects to what they feel to be an overmastering call of duty, or because they cannot get on in the Church at home, or are unable there to see their way to holy orders. No doubt the former motive is the "heroic virtue" of which Aristotle speaks; and all honour, say I, to those who can feel such a call abroad to be their life-work, and have the grace to make it so. But have we a right to expect this of the ordinary rank and file of men who enter the sacred ministry? Surely it is a mistake to encourage the idea that when a man volunteers for foreign work he is necessarily, or even ordinarily, entering then on his life-work. Surely the Church would do well to take a leaf out of the army's book. There each officer is expected, as an essential part of his training and experience as an officer, to see foreign service, to be quartered in one or more foreign stations, before he settles finally to home duty. Why should not every young clergyman be encouraged at the outset of his career—encouraged, I say, not required—to devote a few years to such colonial or missionary work as his capacities and his predilections fitted him for, with the full understanding that such foreign service, if endorsed with the approval of the colonial or missionary bishop under which he had been working, should count towards his promotion when he returned to serve the home Church; so that the man who had gone through such foreign service satisfactorily should stand on an advantage, instead of (as now) at a disadvantage in respect of the stay-at-homes, who had not qualified themselves by this larger experience. I would place this foreign service probation early in his career, say immediately, or shortly after serving his title curacy, when he is presumably young, strong, enthusiastic, and as yet disentangled from the cares and expenses of matrimony, which is often so serious a drawback and difficulty to the missionary clergyman. And now let me point out what results might be expected to accrue from such a system. Speaking as an ex-colonial bishop, I need not dwell upon the gain to the colonies of such a constant stream of fresh life-blood flowing to them from the great heart of the Anglican communion. Secondly, as to the men themselves. Can anyone doubt that the rank and file of our English clergymen would be vastly benefited by the enlarged experience of men and things, by the broadened sympathies, by the capacity to "endure hardness," and put up cheerfully with the discomforts and roughness of colonial life that such a discipline would carry with it. While as to the Church at home, she obviously would profit by this improvement in the rank and file of her clergy; we should hear less about clergymen being narrow-minded, and unadaptable, and unduly self-indulgent. The home Church, too, would benefit, and, *pari passu*, the missionary and colonial Church, by thus drawing together the bands of union between them. Missionary interest would be excited, and missionary zeal quickened, by the presence —not sporadically, as now—but up and down each English diocese, of men who had served abroad, and who, as only such men can, realise the needs of the Church abroad, sympathise with and believe in the work of the Church abroad, and are able personally to influence other folk's thoughts and feelings in a like direction. What a focus of missionary zeal and effort would thus be kindled throughout the home Church! How the band between the home and foreign Church would be strengthened, and their reciprocal action stimulated. But all turns on the rulers of the Church. Unless they encourage such a project, it is useless to think of it, and they, I fear, will look but coldly on it. I once, when Bishop of Barbadoes, pressed the point upon the consideration of one of our most respected home prelates, and had my ardour cooled by the reply: "Your plan, no doubt, might be beneficial to the colonial bishops, but we prefer to train our home clergy under our own eye."

The Rev. F. S. May, D.D., Christ Church, Paddington.

Though much has been said well worthy of attention, several points have not been touched upon. For instance, no word has been spoken on the project of a Board of English Church Missions, as advocated especially by Bishop Ellicott. I will confine myself to another topic, bearing chiefly on India. The portion of heathendom

connected politically with the British Crown is relatively far larger than that now connected with any other Christian power. It is rightly said that the Church of England hence incurs an especial responsibility; but our portion of heathendom is really too immense for us to attempt its evangelisation ourselves alone. It is impossible to provide for the Church wants of our overgrown and ever-swelling population at home, and for our emigrants to the colonies, and also to send forth English missionaries enough to a whole continent, as India is. Few, only, of other European nationalities join from the outset our clergy there; and were the number of such to increase considerably, sufficient funds for their support could not be raised in England. While our Church alone is thus necessarily inadequate to the task, other Christians find room there for independent missionary effort. Many of such labourers and their European supporters are essentially one with ourselves in their religious tenets, not in the faith of the Creeds only, but in all doctrine of a practical nature; and have no objection, in principle, to our Episcopacy or our Liturgy. The attitude, therefore, of many of these non-English missionaries is in fact very friendly to us. Yet there is, all along, the mischief of divided counsels with regard to the choice of localities to work in, as to the treatment of caste and marriage questions, and in other ways; and there is the ultimate prospect of their converts forming distinct denominations with which we could not fully fraternise. Would it not be well, then, for our Episcopate in India to adopt a policy which might more strongly attract to actual immediate union with us the bulk of the really orthodox non-British missionaries? Over at least a large part of the Indian area, I think that this is already quite possible. The Metropolitan of Calcutta has power by the Act of Parliament establishing his See, to admit to holy orders such men without exacting subscription to the Thirty-nine Articles, or conformity to the English Prayer Book; though whether the Bishops set over the new dioceses formed from his original diocese have this power likewise, I do not know. [The Bishop of Lahore here said "No."] If so, I for one deeply regret that; the reason for the dispensation throughout the original diocese of Calcutta must hold good for India everywhere. Surely, at any rate, all our Indian Bishops could act thus in territory under native princes; and I think Bishop Gell ordained a man with such dispensation for work in Travancore. But this dispensing power is acted on only very seldom; yet in it I see the means of unifying Indian Christianity to a far greater extent than can otherwise be ever hoped for. However cognate their theological convictions with our own, you cannot expect foreigners to be all prepared forthwith to volunteer acceptance of articles which are excellent for English use, but require special historical study to be intelligently subscribed, which are insular—or, as Bishop Coxe phrases it, "municipal"—in tenor and in authority; nor, again, can we expect them to be all forward to forego their accustomed ritual for our own, and the less so because in missionary practice much of either must be disused, and much adaptation and addition must be in any case allowed. I would, therefore, humbly commend to our right reverend fathers in India the high expedience of urgently inviting foreign European missionaries and societies to join their work and accept their ordination upon the truly Catholic basis of the Three Creeds, and of nothing further than such terms as Archbishop Howley arranged with the late King of Prussia in regard to missions in Palestine, and which the late Bishop of Capetown in like manner proposed to the Dutch in South Africa. Before we had an Episcopate in India, the Church of England largely employed foreign workers; and never was her work more blest than when a Swartz and a Ziegenbalg—a German and a Dane—took part in it. When Bishop Heber entered India, he only required that such foreigners should be episcopally ordained, and urged, indeed, the S.P.C.K. to apply for more recruits to Scandinavia in particular, where such ordination might be had before setting out. By such unified action of other orthodox Europeans with ourselves, while foreign missionary societies would still keep up their special connection with their own work and workmen, as regards support and control, as at present, the Indian Church of the future would be built up more quickly and peacefully, and would be better adapted to the edification of its members, and the attraction of the unbelievers around. Finally, I would add that, by thus "beckoning to our partners in another ship" to "come and help us" in our overwhelming "draught of fishes," the Indian Bishops who lately put forth such an admirable encyclical, would act entirely in accordance with the ideas therein set forth.

The Rev. W. H. Penney, M.A., F.R.G.S.

I should not have spoken but for one remark which has been made with reference to spending the widow's mite to make the missionaries comfortable. Such words unanswered might lead to much harm. I, as the secretary of the Universities' Mission, some time ago returned with Bishop Steere to Africa as his visitor, and thus can speak for those who cannot, from the nature of the case, speak for themselves. I saw what was going on, and I say you cannot make the missionary comfortable. England does not give anything like enough to make them comfortable—at all events in Central Africa. Missionaries in Africa endure daily and hourly privations of which English people can have little idea. In many places they have to live on the ground itself, to the detriment of their health, and often to the loss of their lives. If the missionary can sleep one story from the ground he has a much better chance of living and doing his work. There are no comforts in an African missionary's life, and if there were they could not reach missionaries at many distant stations. Even what are considered the necessaries of life for artisans are rarely seen on a missionary's table in Central Africa, and in truth they are not procurable. The money subscribed for missionary work is not spent on luxuries. There is barely enough for the carrying on of the missions, and I should like to see such an increase in the funds that we might be rich enough to provide a few comforts. What is done in building is an education to the natives, and is a missionary work in itself. For nothing is more closely watched by the uncultured African than the daily life and surroundings of our missionaries.

The Rev. E. Bickersteth, Cambridge University Mission, Delhi.

In the brief time allotted to me I wish to speak of two points only. First, I would say that if India is ever to be brought to the faith of Christ, it will be by missionaries going, not to the aboriginal tribes, but to the Hindoos and Nuham-Madans. The claims of the aboriginal tribes have been urged this evening, and I well remember, when first the plan of a mission from Cambridge was proposed, one of the noble band of men, whom Sir John Lawrence gathered round him at Lahore, saying to me, "Why does not the University found a mission among the aboriginals? All souls are equal, and among the aboriginals converts may be had by thousands." But is there not a mistake underlying the statement, "All souls are equal?" No doubt in the sight of God every soul of man is of the very greatest value, yet it is also true that some men have much influence for good or ill, while others have little or no influence, and from this point of view the true estimate of the soul is its moral capacity; and none can doubt that the Brahman or Mohammedan who becomes a Christian has a vastly greater influence for good than a Christian of the aboriginal tribes. Again, another reason that is urged for our going to the outcast and aboriginal tribes of India is that, as was the case in the early days of the Church, so now it will be again, and the Gospel will be found to spread upwards from the lowest to the highest stratum of society. This argument, however, forgets the peculiar character of Indian society, in which the various castes are separated the one from the other in a way which had no parallel in early days. It was said by a sincere friend of missions, "Unless in India you go to the upper castes, you may cast your bread upon the water, but you will not find it, even after many days." Secondly, let me say that for India we need men who will go there for life. No doubt the suggestion just made, that men should go out for a limited period, is admirable in the case of men proceeding to the colonies, but it is wholly inapplicable to India. I remember his lordship, the Bishop of Lahore, saying, at a meeting which I attended some six years ago, before going to India, that seven years at least are required for the training of an effective missionary. Certainly, now that six years have passed, I feel that one has still very much to do before attaining to a competent knowledge of the language and thoughts of the people. And is it not also true that there is likely to be more *elan* and enthusiasm in the devotion of a life, than in a work which is only taken up for five years?

The Rev. H. ROWLEY, of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel.

I HAD not intended to speak to-night, but I have felt compelled to do so; because something has been said which injuriously misrepresents the action of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel, with reference to special funds, and because anything that is said or done calculated to create distrust in the great agencies through which our Church carries on its mission work in foreign lands, is also calculated to hinder mission work, and therefore to interfere with the object of our present meeting. You have been told by Mr. Sydney Phillips, without any qualification, that the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel declines to receive money for special funds. But that is not the case. For the Society is ready to receive money for 500 special funds, and of the £1,000 which has been paid through the Special Funds Agency, it would willingly have received £750. But upon what terms? These:—It receives money for institutions, not individuals; for dioceses or missions with which it is connected, but not for bishops or missionaries, with the understanding that it shall be disposed of in the same way that it administers the general fund, but for the particular dioceses or missions named by the donors. It declines, in fact, to receive any longer money for the spending of which it is not in any way responsible, but it does not decline to receive money for special missions. You will see, therefore, that Mr. Sydney Phillips did not accurately represent the case. Having said so much, I have said enough for my present purpose, and will say no more.

The Rev. EDWARD HOARE, Hon. Canon of Canterbury and Vicar of Tunbridge Wells.

WE have heard this evening many suggestions for improvement, and no doubt we need improvement, and very great improvement in all branches of missionary work, but, at the same time, let us not forget the great things that God has done for us. Speakers have spoken of missions as failures, and they seem to have forgotten the wonderful things that have been done. I freely admit our defective organisation, but I maintain that, with all its defects, God has made use of it. Remember that in the year 1799 there was just nothing done by the Church of England for the heathen in the extra-colonial world. There was a mission in Tanjore carried on by Danish missionaries, and assisted with funds by the S.P.C.K. The work of the S.P.G. was limited to our own people in the colonies, with the exception of half the salary of a lay teacher in Africa. Eighty-three years ago, when our forefathers were in search for missionaries, they could not find one either ordained or unordained throughout the whole Church of England, and were compelled to go to foreign Churches for their first missionaries. We may rejoice at what has since been done, but it must never be forgotten that the Danes were those who led the way, and that many of our early missionaries were trained at Bale, and came from Wurtemberg, for the simple reason that there were none to be found in England. But now there is a wonderful change, and God has graciously raised up a missionary spirit among us, so that the Church Missionary Society alone now employ more than 220 English missionaries. But, thank God! they are not half the number employed by that society, for the native clergy have been gaining ground on the European missionaries, and at this time the society employs more native clergy than English. There are 222 European, and 249 native clergymen. God has done great things for us, whereof we are glad; and let us not forget it—let us mend our ways if we are in error, let us seek for more life and love, but do not let us think lightly of that which God has so abundantly blessed. Let us not give up our missionary wives, for who can say what a blessing they have proved by the sacred influence of their Christian homes? Let us pour out our hearts before God that He may continue and increase His blessing, and let us strive to help these faithful men who are labouring in His service. I know of men breaking down by reason of the want of help and sympathy. We are told that we should never send out men alone, and I agree with the principle, but how are we to help it? One way is for men to come forward and say, "Here I am, send me;" and we want men moved by the Spirit of the Living God to yield themselves up to His service. One speaker spoke of men going for a few years, in the hope of soon coming back to preferment at home.

We don't want half a heart—we don't want half a devotion—we want the whole man, given up heart and soul for the whole life to the service of the Lord, yielding himself up to be a willing agent, without reserve, in the hands of Him who has redeemed us by His blood.

The Hon. and Rev. H. DOUGLAS, St. Paul's, Worcester.

IT is a pity that so many disparaging remarks are made about the mission work of the Church. I think, with the work doing and the sacrifice it is making, we may look forward with confidence to the future. We have heard it said that the pulpits of our clergy are not freely opened to missionary advocates; but my experience is quite different. I have always seen a great readiness to admit the advocates of mission work to our pulpits, and every year a very large sum of money goes out to foreign missions. Then, see the men who are engaged in the work—see the speakers we have listened to to-night—some of them examples of the missionary band. We must not forget such men as Bishop Steere and Father O'Neile, one of the Cowley fathers, both martyrs in the missionary cause; and look at the Oxford and Cambridge Missions in India, and the men who compose them. Look at Argles, dying at his post, and succeeded by Gore, one of the brightest sons of Oxford. I think that great sacrifices have been made for missions, and they have been blessed by God.

The Right Rev. the CHAIRMAN.

ONE of the most interesting features of this meeting is that several of the speakers that have addressed us are missionaries, who will shortly return to their labours abroad. I think that whatever lack of sympathy with mission work there may be elsewhere, there has been no lack of sympathy here this evening. I am sure that I am expressing the feeling of this meeting when I wish them God's speed and God's blessing on their work. It may add a fresh interest to the paper read by the Bishop of Lahore to know that the bishop was a Reading boy himself, and that he was educated in Dr. Valpy's School, which stood on the very site of this building we are now in.

CONGRESS HALL,

THURSDAY MORNING, OCTOBER 4TH.

The Right Rev. the PRESIDENT in the Chair.

THE CHURCH AND THE UNIVERSITIES.

PAPERS.

The Rev. R. APPLETON, M.A., Fellow, Assistant Tutor, and Junior Dean of Trinity College, Cambridge.

THE eyes of the Church are directed at this moment with a special interest to our two ancient Universities. An important change has recently been impressed upon their constitution—a change which, taken with others that preceded, has, within the last thirty years, materially

altered the relations of the Church to these her two distinguished daughters—her two main strongholds. The latest act of this series of reforms was definitely completed last year, and we are now able to forecast in some measure the effect. It is a matter of great moment that the question should be considered by the Church, and particularly by this assembly, since it must depend now upon the members of the Church at large whether the Universities shall still be nurseries of pious learning and vigorous faith.

In the remarks now offered to the Congress, I must ask to speak for my own University of Cambridge alone, for her case is, in some respects, different from that of Oxford; of the latter I cannot claim intimate knowledge, yet I am fully aware that her welfare is of infinite importance and interest to ourselves.

There are three steps to notice in the changes which we consider, the Acts of 1856, 1871, and 1877. By the Act of 1856, it was forbidden to require any oath or subscription as a qualification for a degree except in theology, or for any emolument available for an undergraduate. For admission, however, to the Senate, the governing body of the University, or to office in general, it was necessary to profess *bona fide* membership of the Church of England. The Tests Act of 1871 abolished this reservation in the case of the governing body of the University, and threw open also all offices except those of the Divinity professors and certain heads and deans of colleges.

One important privilege secured to clergymen by the statutes of many colleges survived the legislation of 1856 and 1871. Ordination enabled a fellow of a college to retain his fellowship for life, or so long as he remained unmarried, while laymen ceased to be fellows after a prescribed period, unless they held office in college. A clergyman, therefore, stood upon the same footing as a college officer; and this was so whether he were resident or not. All this has been changed by the Act of 1877. In the statutes for the University, and for the several colleges which are the result of that Act, the sole qualification for permanent tenure of a fellowship is office in University or college. At the same time, the remaining restrictions of some headships to clergymen, and even to members of the Church of England, are abolished.

By the new University Statutes, no University officer, except the Divinity professors, can be required to profess membership of the Church of England. Only the new Ely professor is compulsorily in holy orders; but since it may be expected that all the professors of Divinity will be clergymen as hitherto, the statutes of the other professorships have not been altered in this respect. The professor of Hebrew may be added, for his stipend is derived almost entirely from a canonry at Ely. The new statutes of the several colleges contain in general no mention of the Church of England, except (1) in the prescription for the chapel services and chaplains, (2) in regard to the deans, (3) in the matter of religious instruction. The deans are, in some colleges at least, to be in holy orders, either compulsorily, or, "if it can conveniently be done;" and the deanship is, in general, made one of the offices which allow a fellowship to be retained. As to religious instruction, the Acts of 1871 and 1877 have both enjoined that sufficient religious instruction shall be provided for all members of each college *in statu pupillari* belonging to the Established Church.

It appears from these details that the legal status of the Church of England in our University at present is as follows :—In the University it is represented by the Divinity professors; in the colleges by the deans (with more or less security), by the services in the chapel, and by some provision for religious instruction.

No doubt it will seem to many who watch the fortunes of the Church that these signal changes have been retrograde, if not altogether disastrous. The policy of a Constantine, they will think, has been abandoned for that of a Julian; the pious intentions of founders and benefactors have been traversed and scouted. Those, however, who have followed the changes in their very home cannot but admit that, at all events, they originated in the Universities themselves, and in the Universities as constituted under the old *régime;* that the men who agitated for them were conscientious men; that the movement reflects an irresistible body of feeling in the country at large; that it has been assented to and supported, at least in part, by many Churchmen in the University; and that it is a part of a larger movement which, by increasing the educational power of the University, will bring great benefits to the Church as well as to the community.

But our concern to-day is not, except indirectly, with this review of past measures. The deduction from it is far more pressing, and is the proper subject of our conference—one of the last importance. It is to be hoped that this debate will assist the Church to grasp well and firmly the actual situation at the Universities, and recognising this, and accepting her new relations to the great centres of education as a matter of fact, to strike out a practical and—I will venture to urge—a hopeful policy. In the face of English thought at this day, it can only be calamitous that she should cling to a vanished ideal and drop her hands in futile discontent with measures that have dissolved the ancient constitution. For, indeed, I hope to show some tokens which allow us to believe that the new idea includes more religious elements than would appear at first glance, that the new constitution is not beyond the quickening power of an elastic faith.

We find such tokens as we review the great motives which have determined the course of the current of change. Two such motives rise up conspicuously before the churchman in his enquiry, and rise with no hostile front, although they may seem to stand apart from his own.

1. First we must recognise the immense increase of knowledge which has been gained since the foundation of the Universities. And this knowledge has engendered a desire for further knowledge in an infinite variety of regions of thought. Education has been amplified a hundred fold. We believe, indeed, that all these paths of knowledge originate in God and lead to Him, that no tract of nature is outside His domain in whom "all things consist." But for a while stern experience has shown that in the survey of many of the fields of existence there are men who fix their attention, as it were, upon the ground and its products, without constantly and expressly referring all the vitality there to the Sun, from whom it is indeed derived. Knowledge in her advance does not own her connection at every step with the highest knowledge, and her votaries do not all accept the formulæ of the historic Church. Whatever we might desire or think reasonable, the fact was incontrovertible that the demands of the nation could no longer be satisfied by the constitution

of the Universities as they existed. We trust that it was the form, rather than the essence, of the religion of them and of the nation which was altered from that of three centuries before. Two courses, at all events, were open—to change our constitution, or to surrender our title of national homes of learning, and to leave it to younger foundations, such as London and Victoria, to win that title, while the older Universities shrank to be representative of the Established Church alone with diminished influence and maimed completeness. The former alternative was chosen, and, once granted that a necessity for choice existed, who shall say that the sons of the Church who gave their votes in that sense did wrong?

2. Thus, then, we may plead that a change was inevitable. But we may take courage again as we examine the aims of the party which was chiefly instrumental in procuring the change. In the less sanguine treatment of the subject writers describe the whole story with a tacit reference to some dark, deadly power of evil as the prime mover. A dreadful apprehension grows in our minds of an unrelenting and irresistible enemy who impels an advancing host against the Church, and overbears or hoodwinks her struggling defenders. But when we come to close quarters with this army of enemies, we find them to be men actuated by a strong desire for knowledge and for freedom, not the most short-sighted or self-seeking of mortals, and full of impulses of justice, and often of religion. If this agitation has issued in an altered status for the Church, it has not been mainly dictated by antagonism to religion as such, or to the Church's form of faith, but by an antagonism, which they at least strove to keep pure, to restrictions which they believed bore hardly upon a considerable portion of the nation, and which it was notorious were in danger of fostering unreality and insincerity in the Universities themselves. They may have been mistaken, but their intention, which I feel confident cannot be disputed as regards my own University, ought to give us confidence both that God will not withdraw His grace, as if from hardened hearts, and also that the Church has not at this juncture so much hostility to encounter as may be supposed from a distant view. The position here maintained is exemplified by an interesting debate and decision taken last year with regard to the new Public Hostels, among which Selwyn College is included. Some members, and indeed prominent members, of the University, were adverse to the recognition of any hostel which required its students to make a profession of belief upon matriculation, but other leading Liberals, who carried the day, argued that it was contrary to Liberal principles to prevent persons from choosing a University course under more direct guidance from the Church, if they so desired.

Such considerations will perhaps give some justification for the opinion of those who, like myself, take a more hopeful view of the situation. To them it seems reasonable to hold that in the Universities the Church has a fair field open to her, if little or nothing more. If there are few privileges and restrictions in her interest, there are theoretically no fetters impeding her. She is a Church disestablished in part, but yet recognised as the representative of theological study and religious discipline and instruction. Her influence, her usefulness, depend upon herself. If she is strong in the field, if she has able men for her professors, her theological lecturers, her deans and chaplains, her ordained

fellows, she will find a wide opening and little prejudice. There is a tendency to respect high-class work in whatever subject, but the respect is procured by the nature of the work achieved and the character of the worker, not by his mere office. Theology, indeed, cannot in most colleges win a fellowship, in none perhaps by itself; the head of a college is not of necessity a clergyman; the Church must seek to exercise her helpful influence by offering the candidate who is otherwise the best intellectually and morally. If we may wish that the Church, as such, commanded more attachment, yet after the fullest admission of this we may discern that the state of things which exists is not without its own advantage. As the matter now stands, every step taken in the cause of the Church has more effect from the very fact that it is spontaneous, dictated by no indirect inducement, and likely to be sincere. No resident fellow will take holy orders except from full conviction and with a single aim, no undergraduate will profess a devotion or a belief that he does not feel.

The Church has, as I have said, a fair field; she will be strong among us in proportion as she is strong in the country at large; what she is in the nation that she will be with us. The Universities are, it is true, a principal element in the nation; they have a considerable share in determining its life; but a University cannot evoke a religious habit if the men whom the country gives to her are without the germs of it: her discipline and instruction could not do so, even under the old constitution, as the past has shown; neither can her religious vitality do so, for this dies down itself, unless it is reinforced by the incoming generations.

So far I have spoken principally of the formal status of the Church among us, but I imagine that the question which this assembly is more anxious to put to those who come fresh from the thick of University experience is rather as to the actual temper and doings of the present time, for these, after all, are the life of which the other is but the framework. Are we animated by an energetic vitality, or is our organism thin and starved, and torpid? We reply that the Universities reflect the life of the nation.

And first, to look at the whole society, we find in Cambridge at this time, as throughout the country, a remarkable vigour in almost every department. The schools of physiology, of history, of engineering, may be called new creations of the last ten years, and there is hardly any school that has not received an access of power and energy. With this vigour there is a general conscientiousness in regard to work and sincerity of speech. Few offices are sinecures, the great majority are discharged with considerable zeal and fidelity. This is the spirit of the place, and holds among churchmen and others alike; we have at least the stimulus of a healthy emulation.

But to come to the school of Theology, which is more distinctively and formally the seat of the Church within us. Vigour and fidelity are felt there no less than in other schools. The passing of the Tests Act of 1871 coincided with the commencement of a remarkable period of progress in this school. Within that period we have seen the institution of a Theological Tripos, which has placed theology on a level with other studies, as qualifying for a degree in honours; and recently the scheme of that tripos has been modified so as to invite students in other

branches to take it after the first degree. We have seen a handsome building erected as a Divinity School, chiefly through the munificence of the late professor. The new statutes have given us (though not from University funds) a fifth Divinity professor, and one of Ecclesiastical History. In her latest action the University has received favourably the requests of the Board of Theological Studies for an increase of the educational staff, especially as regards Pastoral Theology. The colleges have been liberal in providing theological teaching, and always in the maintenance of the chapels and services. Nor must we omit to notice that the large development of the non-collegiate system and of local lectures in large towns, offers great facilities to the Church for the education of poorer students for the ministry. Selwyn College has passed her first year with decided success, and has been recognised as a public hostel. With the commencement of 1881, a School of Preparation for Holy Orders was opened with the active countenance of the present Regius Professor of Divinity, Dr. Westcott; and Ridley Hall, built with a similar design, also commenced work. In the field of missions, a University Mission to North India has fixed a brotherhood of six active men at Delhi, the august seat of the Mogul empire, where most important educational openings have offered, in special harmony with the character of a mission from one of our seats of learning; and in home missions a new and promising departure has been taken in the Easter term of this year, when one of our largest colleges engaged to work a district in South London, following the example of Eton and other public schools.

Even beyond these causes for hope, however, there is one with which many of this audience must be well acquainted—the strong, and full, and increasing tide of moral and religious zeal among our undergraduates. There was indeed a considerable amount of healthy vigour before the last twelve years, but within that period the stream has markedly gained volume and strength. The same period, which has been so fruitful in institutions created by senior graduates, has also its good record to show of work originated and carried out by younger men. The University Church Society has brought together bachelors and undergraduates for discussion and devotion, and has been largely successful for eleven years. Hardly any form of active Christian work is without its representative organisation, maintained by a constant succession of zealous undergraduates, in spite of the difficulty of perpetual change. In Sunday Schools the large Jesus Lane School is conducted by a staff of 105 members of the University, and generally has 20 applicants for work waiting for classes. There are at least some 70 more teachers in other schools in the town, with not a few others available, if there was room to employ them. A District Visiting Society of old standing has 59 districts in the country villages round, and 54 weekly visitors. The Mission of the two Universities to Central Africa has recovered from the paralysis which had fallen upon it as regarded Cambridge, and is now one of the most progressive of missions; Bishop Steere, of London, has found a place upon its roll of heroes beside Bishop Mackenzie, of Cambridge. For this and for the older missionary societies, and in numbers of causes besides, men are found to undertake the irksome task of soliciting subscriptions. The number of workers in the three principal parishes of the town is, in all, 226; and altogether we may compute that at least

one in eight of the undergraduates is actively engaged in Christian work. Moreover, the special feature of this recent period is that this religious work has not been confined to a particular set of men, or to a special school of thought. It has been wide-spread and representative of the whole Church. A considerable proportion of the workers are public school men, and distinguished scholars and athletes; three of the first five wranglers, and the Craven classical scholar of this year are regular Sunday School teachers, and the boats and elevens of the Universities and colleges contribute a fair quota. Along with this religious movement, the moral tone has notably advanced. The temperance movement is strong among us; intemperance is infrequent, if not unknown, except in small and despised sets of men; social purity is commencing an organisation among us. We begin a new campaign, if it be so regarded, with an excellent equipment.

No doubt there is something to be said on the less cheerful side of the picture. I have avowedly drawn the brighter side. There is a great deal of free enquiry, and this results sometimes for younger men in a vague suspension of belief, and older men are, in not a few cases, negative and silent. But those who cannot themselves accept the Christian faith are seldom openly scornful or bitter, and are very generally men of high morality, so far as that can be without the motive power of a personal faith.

No doubt, also, it may be asked whether this full current of hearty Christianity will continue to flow. We ask the question ourselves, but with an anxiety that is not gloomy; and we foresee that the result lies very largely in the power of the National Church herself.

What then, we ask once again, with all this information before us, what is to be the Church's policy?

We ask you above all to trust us, and to be hopeful. Let me repeat once more that the Universities reflect the life of England. Our undergraduates come up from the schools, and half of their three years of residence is passed away from our walls. Much depends upon the schools, but far more upon parents. At the Church Congress of 1880, the opinion of a schoolmaster was quoted, to the effect that the school by itself was almost powerless to foster religion where the parents had neglected to implant it. We re-echo that declaration. More than that, we urge that the colleges will be guided to some extent by the desires of parents. At least, if parents are indifferent, the colleges may judge that a religious curriculum is not desired or appreciated. But while we contend that the first elements of religion must be imparted at home, we believe that we may be trusted to do our proper work. The faith of our students will be tried indeed, and will have its strength tested; but we believe that it will be quickened, developed, and assured. There are no unfair hindrances to religion among us; there are a thousand stimuli to it.

If churchmen, then, can trust us, trust our theological school and our more general temper, they should continue to contribute endowments. And in particular the study of theology needs further endowment, not so much in the way of prizes for distinguished success, as in the foundation of exhibitions to enable poorer men who intend to enter the ministry to come to the University, or to remain there after their degrees and read before ordination. Selwyn College, Cavendish

College, the non-collegiate system, and the colleges in large towns, afford opportunites of which churchmen should see the usefulness.

Another consideration follows. If facilities for education are so much increased, we may ask the bishops to trust us by exacting more from our candidates for ordination. We urge that if the present requirements were increased, there exist in the Universities, and in the University extension, sufficient facilities for the education, general and theological, that would be needed.

But in all that is done, whether liberal men give endowments to the study of theology or to candidates for holy orders; whether bishops direct their students to a fuller education before they apply for admission to the ministry, or the religious parent enquires whether his son or daughter may be launched upon a University course without peril, we believe we have shown you grounds for confidence in us, in our theological school, in the religious temper of our undergraduates, and in Cambridge with her liberal spirit; we deprecate suspicion of our University, or antagonism to her, or despondency, and we deprecate it the more, because we are sure that if you withhold your trust in us, we shall cease to deserve that trust, for the strong pulse of life that beats now within us will then slacken and decay, leaving us and you starved and poor indeed.

The Rev. J. Wordsworth, Canon of Rochester.

In dealing with this important subject, I shall confine my remarks to three only of the many topics which present themselves:—

First.—The legal position of the Church in the University of Oxford under the new statutes.

Second.—How we may improve that position in regard to general education.

Third.—Oxford as a place of clerical and missionary training.

First, then. what is the present legal position of the Church? We have suffered, during the last twelve years, a loss of authority and a sentence of disendowment more serious and severe than is generally understood. In clerical offices alone the Church has lost, I believe, by the statutes which became law last year (May, 1882), not less than forty thousand pounds a year of income. In regard to authority, the case is this. Up till 1871, membership of the Church was generally required of all who took part in our government, and a certificate of baptism was usually demanded from those who entered as undergraduates. Now, no official enquiry is made as to the belief of any person whatever, except in the case of about thirty clerical officers distributed over eighteen colleges, and a few candidates for special exhibitions. I do not, however, count in this enumeration the new foundations of Keble and Hertford, and Lincoln College, which, to some extent, retains its ancient constitution.

What remains beyond this? In the first place we have a general recognition of "religion" in all our new statutes, which direct us in electing to our headships and fellowships to choose those persons who, in our judgment, are most fit for the government or fellowship of our college,

"as a place of religion, learning, and education." The common-sense interpretation of this important word "religion" is the faith of Christ as professed by the Church of England. No other sense is known to our ancient statutes, which are everywhere presupposed as the foundation of the new code, and tacitly accepted as governing the meaning of terms in common use among us. No other religion is publicly recognised in the University, or can claim any large proportion of our members as its adherents. On the other hand, the University Tests Act, of 1871, forbids us to disqualify any candidate on the ground of religion. We are, therefore, unable to do more than make enquiry as to religious fitness, by examination or otherwise, and to vote as our conscience directs us on the result of that amongst other enquiries. Churchmen, I hope, will not neglect this most serious duty, and I take the opportunity to urge it very strongly—but they cannot be surprised if those who are not churchmen take a different view of this obligation from themselves.

Besides this recognition of religion in the statutes, which is valuable rather as a direction than a command, we retain at present the examinations in religious knowledge and the instruction which precedes them, and the daily and other services in our chapels and in the University Church. Each college has at least one recognised teacher, who is usually the chaplain, and who is the only person authorised to give religious instruction within the walls. This is not necessarily confined to preparation for the examinations, which are passed as a matter of routine by the great mass of undergraduates; but it is far too apt to be so. The examinations themselves are necessarily as superficial as other pass examinations, and any serious attempt to raise the standard is felt as a dangerous tension by all parties. Attendance again at chapel has ceased in many cases to be a regular part of college discipline, and is very slack on week days, and even on Sundays: while the University sermons are much less frequented than of old, except in the case of very well-known preachers.

Yet with all these immense losses and drawbacks, we have much to to be thankful for. Even the word religion in our statutes is of value, as it at least obliges all electors to think seriously of this element as one of the three great factors of University life. Still more valuable are the other ties which bind us to the Kingdom of God. The prayers of two or three daily gathered together in the name of Christ; and the weekly communions, now very frequent, if not universal among us, secure, be it remembered, the fulfilment of our Saviour's promise; they bring His sacred presence to shield us from the attacks of the evil one, and to spread a tone of holiness and peace over our whole life. They lead many to holy orders, or at least to the communion of the Church, who would otherwise be little affected by religion.

Again, though the examinations in religious knowledge are very unsatisfactory, especially from a dogmatic point of view, yet they secure, I believe, a much wider and more accurate knowledge of the Bible than is attained by the young men of the same class in any other nation in Christendom, unless it may be in the United States. When I explained their character some months ago to Father Curci, who is making heroic, but alas! very solitary efforts, to extend Biblical study in Italy, he was simply astonished; and spoke with loving enthusiasm of the greatness of our privileges. The English Sunday, and the English reverence for

the Bible, were to him the great glories of our land, and no one who has met him can doubt his wide experience, or the saintly clear-sightedness with which he foresees the dangers of a community unblessed with these advantages. Let us therefore thank God for what we retain. If we train up only one generation more in the ways of the Church, that is much—very much—when we are training for eternity.

Yet the outlook is very serious. The failure of religious discipline is contemporaneous with the decay of the common life of which our colleges afforded so remarkable an example. A type, as valuable as it was almost unique, is being destroyed in Oxford just at the moment when public opinion is recognising its efficacy, and striving to create it in other places. Instead of colleges of priests and churchmen, bound by no vows, but with a deep unity of purpose underlying their different aims (which, though doing little for science and systematic philology, were instruments of extraordinary power in the service of a liberal culture), this generation has substituted conglomerates of individuals, who are little more than partners in a common business. They inherit indeed a lofty tradition, they are engaged in an ennobling profession, they live under the shadow of great names ; and enlightened self-interest may keep them to some extent on the old lines. But we who love Oxford cannot but shudder sometimes when we think of the hands into which our ancient homes may possibly fall. Even what we retain is grudged us by not a few, and it is impossible to feel secure in its possession, unless public opinion throughout the country should give us the moral support, which is no longer afforded by our own internal constitution.

This leads us to the *second* topic of my paper—How we may improve our position in regard to general education. In respect to this I will not specially dilate on the duties of Oxford residents, but of those who are less easily brought within the compass of an academic audience. It is a great privilege to address so powerful an assembly as that now before me—members of perhaps a thousand homes, fathers and mothers and near relatives of hundreds of our undergraduates present and to come. These, I may venture to say, and I say it with a deep sense of the issues involved, are now called upon, in the course of divine Providence, to step into a new position. They have a most solemn duty added to their old responsibilities. In past times, when a father sent his son to Oxford, he knew pretty well what to expect. He knew that the young man would live in a closely-knit society, the elder members of which were mostly in holy orders, pledged, that is, to a life of prayer and religious study, while the younger ones would be all outwardly disciplined in Christian faith and knowledge. He might reasonably be satisfied with these guarantees. But now, if he be wise, he will make much stricter enquiries. He will ask what is the character of the head and of the tutors? how are they affected towards the Church? is the chaplain a man likely to be respected and to give help to a young man in difficulties? And when he sends up his son he will desire the Head of the College to be good enough to place him under this or that tutor, whom he knows to be a Christian man. There is nothing underhand in such enquiries and requests. It is painful, perhaps, to have to make them, but it is necessary ; and the fact that such enquiries should be regularly made by parents—as indeed they are frequently made at the present time—must have a very salutary effect upon the appointment of

tutors, and upon the conduct of the tutors themselves. Some, at least, of the scepticism and indifference to religion which, unhappily, exists among a portion of our teachers, is due to ignorance and inexperience. They have always lived a sheltered life, chiefly among the young and the sanguine, and they are apt to think that the morality, which to them is customary, is due to their own strength; and so they are inclined to undervalue the grace of God and the safeguards of religion.

But if we Oxford teachers find that parents of all classes—vigorous country gentlemen and hard-headed lawyers, and men of business, as well as the clergy (who, strange to say, are not always as circumspect as they might be) insist upon their sons having religious teaching, and being placed under proper Christian influences, our own faith will be affected in a very real and healthy manner. Faith, we all know, is propagated by faith much more than by argument. We begin to prize, or at least to respect, what we see others prizing. If they can see beyond the limits of the visible and the tangible, we are a little ashamed to confess ourselves utterly earthbound.

This, then, is the first thing that fathers and mothers can do for us—they can shame us into faith. Next, they can restore the old family discipline of catechising and bible-reading, which appears to have been very much dropped in the upper ranks of society. My experience leads me to think that a bible-class for mothers of the wealthier class would be about the best expenditure of time possible to a parochial clergyman. Many of them, I believe, long for it, and somewhat resent the almost exclusive devotion to the poor, which is the easier method of pastoral work. Were such things more common, we should not find numbers of young men of the most influential position, coming even from clerical homes and good schools, more ignorant of the elementary facts of religion than some National school-children. Much, too, may be done by the choice of schools, and by the expectation and requirement of a higher standard of religion in those who are admitted as teachers. It is too true that the class of clergy engaged in education is not always the most spiritual. We have missed the training which comes only from contact with poverty, suffering, and sickness. But I am thankful to believe that there is now a tendency to look upon such duties in a higher light, and to draw to school-work and college-work something of the missionary earnestness which leads other men, at one time to the railway arch of Hackney Wick, at another to Zanzibar or Calcutta. We want this spirit in our schoolmasters and our chaplains, and must have it if the Church is not to be weak and hollow, and to come crashing down on those pillars of it which, outwardly, are most beautiful. The "conducticius," or hired chaplain, without a fellowship, may not be in a very enviable position, but it may be made a most useful one. The chaplain-fellow ought surely to feel himself called to a noble office.

Thirdly, I will ask you to consider Oxford as a place of clerical and of missionary training. It is a matter of anxiety to many of us lest the development, now happily given to diocesan and missionary colleges all over England, and the discouragement unhappily experienced by the secularisation of so many endowments, should prejudice a growing and very hopeful work. Our theological school, though not perfect, has worked a great change both in teachers and taught. It has raised up a class of systematic students of theology, of all ages, far

larger than existed twenty years ago. Candidates, even for the lowest honours, generally offer a subject of dogmatic theology and a period of Church history, besides the large portion of the Bible which is the foundation of the whole system. As an examiner during the last two years, I can testify that both these subjects are usually very well done; and I feel sure that without the training so given in the University, the Church would never be able to satisfy the large demand made upon her, at home and abroad, for trained teachers; and would be in much greater danger of heresy and schism than she is at present. I am, therefore, convinced that if a man is able to afford three years of preparation, the year of classical training followed by two years of theology under a variety of teachers of wide experience, is better than the two years of a theological college, even balanced by the freer intercourse and more spiritual discipline which a seminary life admits. I need not enlarge on the social advantages of residence in one of the older colleges to a candidate for orders—not in the sense of worldly advancement – but of giving him an insight into the thoughts and ways of educated people, and of putting him on his proper level, and abolishing provinciality and conceit. But, if a man can only afford to reside as an unattached student, he is still partaker of many of our best traditions. If he is able enough to make his way into Keble College, he will find a congenial and vigorous society, which, I need not say, has been an untold blessing to many, both inside and outside its walls. To churchmen generally in Oxford it has given courage, hope, example. It has fostered and developed very many movements for good besides those which are its immediate object. Then again the Pusey Memorial, with its librarians and chaplains, will be, we devoutly trust, a new and quite independent centre of religious learning and spiritual comfort, freely accessible to all members of the University. Lastly, in St. Stephen's House and Wycliffe Hall, we have institutions directly intended for the training of candidates for orders—both of which may be destined some day to grow to large dimensions. Of St. Stephen's House, with which I am intimately acquainted, I should desire to be allowed to say a few words. It was at first intended specially for graduates (in which class are included men already in holy orders) who might wish to reside and attend theological lectures. But as this class does not fill its rooms, the committee are ready, at present, to admit undergraduates also, who are candidates for orders in England or elsewhere, and to give them board and lodging, and the discipline of a regular life, for as small a sum as possible (about £2 a week). From the first, however, the house has had a distinctly missionary character. As many as sixteen of the fifty students who have resided in it from time to time since its opening in October, 1876, have been working, or are shortly about to work, in the mission field—especially India and Central Africa. Our second student and second principal, Marsham Frederick Argles, the beloved friend of many of us, and now we trust with God, was one of the foundation stones of the Oxford Mission to Calcutta. Another, C. A. Janson, of like character and holy life, has died in harness in Central Africa. These memories already sanctify its walls, and have already begun to bear the fruit natural to such precious examples. St. Stephen's House

seems now ripe for much larger development. In a few days it will re-open with eleven or twelve students. Were it able to offer small exhibitions in any number, it would attract a much larger body of missionary candidates. With a solid foundation, St. Stephen's House might easily become the recognised missionary college of the Church in Oxford. That such a college is necessary is one of my firmest convictions, enforced by the experience of missionaries from every quarter. I have not time now to explain the special reasons of this conviction, nor why it is better that such candidates should be united in one body, rather than sent with exhibitions to the older colleges. It is clear, however, that this would ensure greater economy and stricter discipline, and be more impressive to the men themselves and to the world outside. Let us conclude by picturing to ourselves the moral effect, upon the world and the Church, of a gathering in Oxford of students of all races and all dioceses of the Anglican communion, living a united religious life, using all the old appliances for knowledge with which God has blessed us, and stimulating new ones into activity. Is not this one of the noblest objects which a Church can have set before it as a creation suited to our growing needs? That since 1870 five homes of the Church and faith of Christ* have been practically added to our old institutions, is surely in itself a most hopeful sign of the vitality of our communion in Oxford. We are hardly yet ripe for a wholly new departure, but the development of St. Stephen's House into a powerful missionary centre is, to my mind, the best work we can aim at in the years that are coming.

ADDRESSES.

The Rev. Canon King, D.D., Regius Professor of Pastoral Theology, Oxford.

As people of the present day say we shall arrive at the truth if we speak from the facts as they come before us, I wish to say a few simple things, speaking simple facts which come to me, in some sense, from my enjoyable but simple relation to the University of Oxford. Speaking, of course, as a churchman, I cannot say that everything in the University is just as I should like to have it. But at the same time I am bound to say that from many points of view there is plenty of work to do, and sufficient freedom left—God helping us—to do it. Therefore, it is that I must speak, if I speak truly, in the spirit of personal hope for the future of Christianity in the Universities, and that for some simple reasons. First, then, because it seems to me that the scare of unbelief is in some measure, and in a considerable measure, I think, less than it was among the young men twenty years ago. The scare of unbelief is going away. Some thirty years ago, when the storm of unbelief first reached Oxford, all the most difficult and fundamental questions that a man could consider were raised and brought before us. We were asked constantly what our views were on the inspiration of the Holy Scriptures, what we thought about the canon of Scripture,

---

* Keble and Hertford Colleges, St. Stephen's House, Wycliffe Hall, and the Pusey Memorial.

what we thought about the divinity of our blessed Lord, what we thought about the existence of the soul, and what we thought about the existence of God, what our principle of right and wrong really was, and our basis of morals. Now all those great questions brought before a man, and especially a young man, under the most favourable circumstances must cause him considerable strain and pain of mind, and what happened I believe was this : the strain and pain of mind was not unnaturally mistaken by young men for doubt and breaking down of the faith. But a little later we got less frightened about the pain and distress through which we had to pass. Indeed in some sort it has been a comfort to us, and a proof that we are simply among those whom God has been pleased to employ from time to time to do, so to say, His work —His greatest of all works, in bringing wandering men back to Himself. If Moses of old felt that he was not eloquent, and if Jeremiah felt that he was a child, and if Jonah and Saint Chrysostom fled—if these men fled when they were called to do the Lord's work, it is a comfort that we too feel inclined to fly, and that we are children, and cannot bear the burden put upon us. It is evident that the truth is the same in its fulness, richness, and weight, and surely we ought to have known this, we who had the privilege in former years—a privilege which I hope people will avail themselves of now, and in the future—of being taught in Bishop Butler's *Analogy*. He told us a hundred years ago that if the world had been made, not as it is, but as people sometimes think they could make it, and if we had been suddenly born into the world without the apparent waste of time that we spend in our cradles and swaddling clothes, if we were born into the world with our full powers developed, it would take us a considerable time to be accustomed to ourselves—that there are many parts of us which, in our first consciousness of them, might be very strange and difficult to understand ; so that one might fear to open one's mouth, and doubt if we put out our tongue whether it would come back again. But by the merciful providence of God we are brought into existence with such a harmonious incapacity, that by the time we have power to destroy ourselves we ought to have attained wisdom enough to leave ourselves alone ; to leave ourselves in His hands who has known how to make us better than we ourselves. Now, it is from this sort of reasoning that the scare of unbelief has grown less alarming. We are becoming accustomed to the consideration of these great truths, and the sort of results which may quite naturally and rightly follow. Therefore, it enables many an honest and brave young man of the present day to endure with a greater degree of calmness and composure the gallant young sceptic who charges at him with lance sharpened and polished, not taken out of the Bodleian, and not invented by himself, but picked up, probably, last night in a smoking room, from a newspaper report of a review of a translation of some German work. And so we are getting to be a little quieter respecting these apparently terrible things. There is another reason which makes us somewhat less frightened—namely, that we are better able now to determine the relative value of the different kinds of truth and learning which are proposed to us. It was not at all strange that people who gave themselves to the study of physical science, and after a term's reading knew so very much more than any of us who had not had that term of reading, should think that they had got upon something which would always satisfy them completely. But we are beginning now to find that, great as these things are, they do not satisfy the whole man. I have had letters from a hard-working clergyman from Switzerland, who in his frankness and openness to me has said, "Really I feel better and fresher and altogether 'gooder,' if I may use such a word, on the top of the mountains than when I am constantly in my schools and in church." But such men do not mean that they would give up their schools and church ; they only mean that there is a great pleasure and great change on the mountain tops provided by God which will help them in their

work at home to do it better. This is what is going on. Men have gone into the schools of natural science cordially and happily, and they have gone into schools of history; but I hear them say that after all this will not do if this is to be our religion. It will not satisfy us. What the philosopher finds in this way is not what satisfies the man. It is a great help to him; it will enrich him and enable him to go up higher when he adds to it the truth of God. This is what we are coming to. It seems to me we are able to give a better judgment as to the relative value of the advantages which many young men now receive, so that with reverent quietness they will bow to the professor of any department of science, and say, "Thank you; if you wish me to take that as my all, I cannot." This is a great gain for us. Again, it seems to me that there are now men in the University who are drawing more closely and more really to the several great parts of the truth, and the outcome of it is, that we shall have higher, truer, stronger, and braver lives than we have yet had. Yet do not think I am a mere visionary, and that I am in a dream. There are dangers, real dangers; but they ought not to take the heart out of a man. What, then, can we do to help in this state of things? First, I must say again, what has been said by the previous speakers, that a great deal depends upon parents. Aye, good friends, I see something of your children, and what I warn you is this, Do take care against sending your boys to creedless schools. "I was told," said a young undergraduate to me once, "that I should find it an advantage to go to Oxford without having my opinions settled; but I have not found it so." Why is it that people are anxious now about the harvest? I know there is some not gathered in, some I saw yesterday not cut. It is the late sowing which risks the harvest. Put in good seed at the right time and then trust. The Creed, the Ten Commandments, the Lord's Prayer, and the old-fashioned Sunday, these are the things they want. We want, too, voluntary associations. There is no doubt a great loss, and danger, possibly, of a greater, from the withdrawing of clerical fellows. The danger is not so much to the very good young man who is already three parts a clergyman, but the danger is to the man who, perhaps, will be a better clergyman in the end, but who wants the old restraints of the Church of England University. There is a danger of losing these men, and they are the flower of the flock; what we want is some kind of voluntary association to take care of them and give them some quiet rule of life, to give them some religious instruction, something to help just to keep within those limits so that they shall not hamper their future. We have seen men in these last days establishing mission work in the east of London. I know there are numbers of men ready to go out into the most neglected parts of our towns and cities. Having been brought, under the dispensation of God, by unbelief into this serious contact with great truths, we realise more the oneness of humanity. We are all made of one blood, and all classes and races begin to disappear when realising the one Fatherhood of God—one in England, one in India, one in Africa. Thus we trust will Oxford realise a new sense of responsibility, and go forth and bring together England and India, and, as far as may be, the uttermost parts of the world, until humanity shall find its true rest by coming into conscious union with the truth, and through the truth realise the blessed freedom of personal holiness and peace.

The Rev. J. E. C. Welldon, Master of Dulwich College.

It is known, perhaps, to some few members of the Congress, that this is not quite the first or only occasion on which I have had the privilege of addressing an assemblage of my fellow-churchmen upon the religious condition of the Universities.

I would rather not repeat to-day what I have said before. I will try, then, simply to estimate, as my experience at Cambridge may enable me, what is the present opportunity, what the duty of the English Church, what are the grounds of fear or hope—and especially of hope—which may suggest themselves to any earnest and religious mind in the University. Something I had meant to say has been taken from me by the addresses to which you have listened; you will forgive me, then, if my speech shall seem imperfect.

Let me say, first of all, that it is, in my thinking, a serious error to regard the English academical world as wholly given up to speculative infidelity. The number of men who think deeply and anxiously about religious questions is only small; and of such men not a few are still believers. I used to think that the sermons preached from the University pulpit were much too learned; for it is only the few who need intellectual help, and they are not often to be found in the University church. Nor even among thoughtful men is it scepticism, truly so called, which is to be feared. I did not find, when I was a college tutor, that it was my cleverest pupils who were the most troubled by sceptical doubts; on the contrary, in my own college, the cleverest, the most distinguished undergraduates were almost always the most regular in their attendance at the chapel services. I could not but notice, too, that there were some even among the most highly gifted sons of the University, who were marvellously shielded all their time through from unbelief, who seemed to walk, like the Holy Children, through the furnace without the breath of fire ever passing upon them. I was led to the inference that belief or unbelief is much less a matter of the mere reason than people are apt to suppose. Infidelity, as I understand it, is not so much an intellectual malady as an atrophy of the spiritual sense. And, as that is so, I think the best advice which can be given to any young man at his entering upon an academical career, is not that he should try to close his ears—for that were impossible—to the cruel voices which are rife around him, nor even that he should occupy himself much in the study of Christian evidences and of apologies, however excellent, for the faith, but that by prayer and public worship, and the discipline of good works and communion with sorrow and suffering, he should keep alive the religious faculty within him.

I say again, I have no fear of critical inquiry; cricitism, if it ever were a thing to be feared, has done its worst. What I do fear is a prejudice against religion, an assumption quite unwarrantable that about God and things divine no sure knowledge is, or ever can be, attained, so that men who will spend half a decade of their years in tracing the development of some poor germ, or trying to reconstruct a broken work of ancient art, will think it ill to waste a single brief half-hour in seeking to learn from the voice of Nature, or of conscience, whether there be a God and a world beyond the grave. When I think of such men whom I have known—so noble as they are, so far removed from faith—and ask how they are to be won again to Christ, I must admit that my heart sinks within me. I do not think that argument does much good, except defensively. But to me, it has been an ever surer conviction that the field upon which the battle of belief will be fought to its ultimate issue, is the region of personal holiness. And as there is a power, even an argumentative power, which passes words, in human goodness, so when I look upon the Church as a body, I think that, if she will show a large and liberal spirit, if she will welcome the first gleam of reviving faith, if she will ally herself, so far as may be, with those who as yet do not recognise her authority, it is by her manifold works of charity and beneficence, by the crusade already waged against intemperance, by the yet greater crusade which at this Congress has been proclaimed against impurity, it is in these and a hundred other ways that she may win the co-operation of men now lost to her, who, afterwards, if God

will, shall pass to be loyal sons and subjects of the Faith. Only I do want to say this, that if there is any religious body which shall reclaim them, it must be the Church. For she is not now one of many rival systems ; she stands practically alone. This is strikingly the case in the University to which I belong. Roman Catholicism, that august and ancient system, has no power or promise at Cambridge ; I do not remember that any one of my contemporaries became a convert to the Church of Rome. Protestant Nonconformity, eminent as it is in the lives of many of its representatives, has yet too little of logical and historical basis to stem the tide of modern thought ; and practically, at the most, it remains where it was. The Theistic Church, which still exists, I believe, in London, has been ever but a trunk without branches, and already the trunk is withering away. There were once two Positivists at Cambridge, who held meetings, but they were brothers, and they died out. A society which, if it was anything, was Unitarian, formed some time ago for the free discussion of religious problems, is dead also. More and more it is coming home to the hearts and intellects of earnest men that, if there is to be a religion of the future, it must be found within the precincts of that Church which is historical, and yet progressive; conservative and yet liberal, which is ever free and tolerant and hopeful, which asks no questions of her members, which sheds the blessing of her ritual and her teaching, like the sunlight, on the unthankful and the evil. I regard this as a singular advantage of the Church at the present time.

I shall be following the impulse of my heart if I add, as a second point, the mutual goodwill of all the Christian denominations. It has seemed strange, perhaps, to some members of the Congress that, although much has been said this morning of the difficulties which beset the Church in the Universities, no allusion has been made to Dissent. Yet, whatever may have been the precise operation of the University Tests Act, of 1871, I do not hesitate to say that it has not been unfavourable to the Church. I count it little—forgive my saying so—that among the Nonconformists who have come to Cambridge, there are some few who, by a formal, definite act, have chosen to pass from the communion of their forefathers to the pure and Catholic worship of the Church. It is a higher result, as I would think, that nearly all the Nonconformists whom I knew at college have come to look upon the Church no longer as an enemy, but as a friend. The eminent Nonconformist mathematician who, although he never renounced his Nonconformity, yet at his death the other day in a foreign land, was secretary of a fund for building an English church in the mountain-village to which he had been banished for his health, and who, from his deathbed, wrote a letter in behalf of the project he had so much at heart—he was a type of many Nonconformists, some of them, I rejoice to think, among my pupils, who, within the pale of a national University, have learnt, half unwillingly, perhaps, at first, to know and love and reverence the National Church.

And along with the goodwill of those who stand without the Church, may I mention the moderate spirit of Churchmen themselves? I do not say how much of this is due to the influence or those who have so long been the leaders of religious thought at Cambridge—I mean the present Bishop of Durham and Dr. Westcott. But it has always seemed to me a striking and hopeful fact in a society composed so largely of young men. There is little extravagance of opinion or practice in the University, hardly any desire to emphasise particular modes or sides of thought beyond due measure. You will suffer me to illustrate my meanings by one example only out of many. It happened only a short while before I left the University, that two well-known clergymen, whom I do not name, paid a visit to it as representatives of the Church Association, to assist in establishing a branch of that society among the undergraduates and junior residents of the University ; and after we had listened to

them with much patience at a long meeting, and had weighed the force of all they had to say, we passed a resolution by a majority of nearly six to one that no branch of the Church Association was desired in the University of Cambridge.

Yet, I need not say, after Mr. Appleton's paper, that the moderation of which I speak does not mean lethargy. I listened to the instances he gave of spiritual activity; I could add to them if time allowed. I was thinking, as he spoke, that even in the number of candidates for holy orders, there has been a striking change within my own college of late years. There was a period—I am apt to call it the age of rationalism—during which no Fellows of the college, or hardly any, were ordained. It is a college in which the vacancies in the Fellowships are few, not much more than one a year since I have known it. Yet, since the beginning of the year 1880, five Fellows of the college, and as many scholars, if not more, have been ordained deacons; and I know that there are several among the younger members of the foundation, who are anxiously looking forward to the time when they too shall be admitted to the same sacred office. I do not say these things to please you, but because the danger of the Church in this our day seems to me to be that she will lose faith in herself, that she will not rise to a sense of her high calling, that she will suffer herself to dwell more in her secret thoughts upon the few doubtful privileges which she has lost, than upon the infinite possibilities which are daily opening before her in the singular concurrence of events which, unless I greatly err, is drawing the hearts of religious men ever more and more together, and leading them to see the best security for faith, for Protestantism, for Christianity, in the National Church of England. And yet, if I may sum up in one brief sentence the lesson which has been borne in upon my mind by the study of contemporary life and thought at Cambridge, it can, indeed, be no other than this—that it will be the Church's wisdom in the future to place her trust, not so much in institutions or in privileges fenced and guarded by legal enactments, which, after all, may fail her in the hour of need, but to place it rather in the sanctity and self-devotion of individual Christian lives. For not once or twice only when I have been troubled, as I suppose we all are troubled from time to time, by a sense of the indifferentism and infidelity in the University, I have found the hope of its regeneration—a hope which will not, I think, pass away—in the presence of a body of men who do not live much, perhaps, in the eye of the world, but who are full of love for Christ, who do their duty quietly, who spend themselves and their time and money in good works, and who, if the thought of reward ever presents itself to their minds, do not look for it, and will assuredly not receive it from the generation to which they consecrate their lives.

DISCUSSION.

The Hon. and Rev. A. T. Lyttelton, Master of Selwyn College, Cambridge.

My object in coming forward is partly a selfish one, and is owing to the very kind remarks made by Mr. Appleton about Selwyn College. There was one phrase, however, which he used which might have been misunderstood by some who heard it. He seemed to imply that a profession of belief was required from all those who entered Selwyn College. Now, in one sense that is true. We require that they should be members of the Church of England; but the words, "a profession of belief," suggest to one's mind something like signing the Thirty-nine Articles, or making some other form of declaration than that contained in the simple words—a member of the Church of England. In nine cases out of ten, or perhaps more, that declaration will not be made by the men themselves, but by their parents and

guardians ; and in the few remaining cases in which there are no parents or guardians to make the profession, I believe that even the most scrupulous defender of the rights of tender consciences will not deny that the men have reached the age at which they may judge for themselves on this question. That is not a correction, but rather an explanation of what Mr. Appleton said, and I thank him for his reference to Selwyn College. Now, let us pass away from the college with which I am connected, because in a discussion of this kind Selwyn College must be looked upon as an exceptional experiment, and therefore cannot be taken as a proof as to the relation of the Church to the University at large, although, if necessary, I should not shrink from telling you several things connected with the college in the small sphere of work which lies before it, to show that it will not be found inadequate in doing the Church's work in the University. Passing, then, to the general condition of things in the University of Cambridge, I believe one great ground of hope is that there are very many signs that the authorities at Cambridge are beginning, or, at least, are not beginning, but continuing and increasing in the belief that a greater prominence must be given to the direct tutorial relations between undergraduates and those in authority —for without some such tutorial relation it is very difficult for the religious part of the work to be developed or improved at all. Perhaps Mr. Welldon will pardon me for referring to the work he was so instrumental in carrying on—namely, the great and beneficial influence that the tutors of King's College have upon their undergraduates, and many Cambridge men here will know of the similar work at Pembroke College, which is so largely due to the present Master of the college, who still, happily, occupies the post of Tutor. In every college, I believe, there is an increased wish among those in authority to influence the undergraduates under them, not only intellectually, but morally and religiously. Well, I won't disguise the fact that we have to confront a certain vague and impalpable feeling, which we cannot call infidelity. We can hardly call by so definite an expression such a vague feeling. It does not rely upon facts, argument, or theory. It does not depend upon what has been done in the past, but upon the fear of what will be done or discovered in the future. Some seem to think that some terrible catastrophe is going to happen to religion. They cannot conceive the idea that it has happened ; but they think that the next scientific discovery, or the next elaborate work of German criticism, or the next number of the *Contemporary Review* will undermine the foundation of faith, and that if they have taken orders it will make them bitterly regret the step. That feeling is at the bottom of a great deal of the hesitation and the difficulty of coming forward among undergraduates now. They do not like to commit themselves to what they think will be a losing cause, and, therefore, one great work of the Church in our Universities is to convince them—we cannot prophesy what will happen in the future—but to convince them of its life, strength, and work, and that the cause of Christ is not a losing cause, but one which in every phase of its existence gathers strength and courage for the future. I must fully and heartily agree in what Canon King said as to the weighty responsibility resting upon the parents. If men come up to Cambridge, or any University, expecting and hoping for religious help, well ; but if not, it is very difficult to force that religious help upon them, and that expectation and hope must be the work of their own homes. I remember an instance, given, I think, by the Archbishop of Dublin, which happened in one of his ordination examinations. One of the candidates was taken to task for the very lamentable ignorance which his paper revealed on the important subject of the Acts of the Apostles, and his answer was, "I am very sorry, but I thought the examination was a fortnight later." I think there must have been something wanting in that man's home training. That is an instance of the ignorance of the candidates for holy orders ; and the ignorance is still greater of men who do not think of taking orders at all. Well, then, in conclusion, may I say that I believe that with regard to the present work, and the present religious condition of things, we do contrast favourably, I will not speak of times beyond my own experience, but with ten years ago, when I was an undergraduate. We have also still left to us a certain vantage ground, and that vantage ground will not be diminished, at least for some time to come, and I am sure, speaking of one part of the vantage ground alone, that the work of the present Regius Professor of Divinity alone constitutes a considerable, and, indeed, inestimable advantage for the Church in Cambridge. But notwithstanding this—this one point I wish to emphasise, that the hope of the present and the future lies in voluntary effort—in the voluntary methods that are being started. Mr. Appleton has given us a list of voluntary efforts, but what the Church ought to set itself to do is, not to rely upon the continuance of the voluntary efforts as long as they are purely voluntary and

unorganised, but, as it will meet with very little jealousy and opposition, to organise, crystallise, and perpetuate these voluntary efforts, so that when the present eager and loyal supporters of them shall have passed away, their methods and institutions shall continue, and be the groundwork and defence of the Church.

The Rev. WILLIAM INCE, D.D., Regius Professor of Divinity, and Canon of Christ Church, Oxford.

IT was my lot to speak on this subject seven years ago at the Church Congress at Stoke-upon-Trent, and I think that the Universities may congratulate themselves now that so much greater attention is paid to the subject by the large audience which is interested in hearing this discussion. This, I think, may be partly accounted for by the fact that we meet in the diocese which contains one of our great Universities, rather than in one of the great pottery towns. I would have preferred that others should speak, as it is desirable that fresh methods of approaching this subject should come before the Congress, and yet I am unwilling to sit by merely as a hearer without adding a few observations with regard to the whole question. And, first, I would say that it is quite impossible that a good deal of the work that is going on in the Universitiy of Oxford should be detailed in public at a large assembly like a Congress. To speak of work that is going on in several of the colleges—work that is undertaken largely by undergraduates themselves—and the wholesome religious influences in actual operation there, would be really to attempt to interfere with what should rather be left to its natural development than brought forward into the clear publicity of a large meeting. At the same time I take the opportunity of testifying, in addition to others, in regard to Cambridge and Oxford, that there are very distinct signs of a great willingness and desire on the part of large bodies of undergraduates to get religious help, and to get enlightenment upon practical and religious subjects. That may be seen, not only in such things as have been mentioned, but in one or two others of a more popular character. One very remarkable instance of this is in what, perhaps, can be hardly called a direct instance of the Church influence upon the University, but it was a very signal thing that when those notable American evangelists, Moody and Sankey, came to Oxford, at some of their later meetings no less a body than 500 undergraduates were present, at all events showing an anxiety for some practical religious help and information not necessarily identifying itself with the particular form in which it might be brought to them. Another, and a very different circumstance, I would take as an instance. It was on the occasion of one Wednesday (in last Lent), when Canon Liddon preached after a long interval of time in the cathedral of Christ Church, which was free to undergraduates, and they presented themselves in vast numbers. And then we must look at the series of extraordinary evening sermons started in the University Church of St. Mary's, at the suggestion of the present President of Trinity. They have been made a continued success. One Sunday night after another during the term the church was filled by large bodies of undergraduates, although the service was not a special University institution. Many came to hear their old masters, and other noted theologians and divines. Then I should like further to bear testimony to one change for the better—although some of us naturally lament several of the changes which have taken place—yet there are great grounds for comfort and solace on the other side; and one is especially made manifest in regard to that question of clerical Fellows. Although the number of those who take holy orders is greatly diminished, yet from the long experience of nearly thirty years of the University, I feel justified in saying that the whole type of clerical Fellows is nobler and truer than in older days. It is impossible now to hear of any new clerical Fellow of whom it can be said that he made it a special boast, as in old days it was said, that he had not once preached a sermon. Those who now take holy orders devote themselves, all from free choice, without any such external control as the statutes of their college. They give themselves to their work with a seriousness which augurs well for their pupils, and they regard all who are placed under their charge as a distinct pastoral care, without any unworthy proselytising method, but with the sincere method of intercourse befitting a really spiritual, manly, earnest, Christian clergyman. And in that respect, truth and sincerity have gained decisively. Further, I should like to say broadly and strongly, that the Church, in its attempt to spread its influence in the University, ought to take care that it should be extremely tender and

sympathetic in its treatment of those who seem partially alienated from it, and unwilling to receive its teaching. Nothing could be more disastrous than for the teachers of the Church to employ the language of anathema, denunciation, or invective, or throw out suspicion of motives in regard to those whom they hope to win over to the opinions, life, and practice of the Christian faith. And a signal instance of the fact that some who are withheld from full assent to the faith and practice of the Church, are men of noble aspirations, is found in the works of one of the most eminent of those who recently held office, the late Professor T. H. Green. Those who knew him, or were brought under his influence, and have read his works that have been published, will recognise the intense moral earnestness that possessed the man, and deeply influenced all his dealings with his pupils. However painful it was to see the attitude of mind which led to his lay sermons; and however distressing to read them, as they renounce much that we hold dear to the faith, it is impossible not to see that the way to approach such men is by finding out some bond of agreement in the first instance; by supplementing that wherein we think their views are defective, by showing the true combination of the philosophic spirit and the theological spirit, and by pointing out Christian faith as the complement of their highest desires and aspirations and feelings, and thus raising them up to the higher level, by beginning, first of all, by genuine sympathies and tender consideration. Lastly, I would say that if the Church is to exert its due influence in the Universities it must do so by fastening its attention upon the great cardinal doctrines of the faith, and not wasting its time in any disputes about lower questions, about ecclesiastical government and ecclesiastical ceremony. And the real points at issue are those which concern the great cardinal doctrines set forth in the Nicene Creed, the doctrine of the Holy Trinity, the great facts of the Incarnation and of the Atonement. I think it will be made manifest to all members of the Congress by the paper read by an Oxford tutor on the first day of our meeting, that there are men in the University who are able to enter upon these higher questions. It is most important that we should not waste our time and energies in lesser questions, but should attend to those grand fundamental vital truths of the faith.

The Ven. George Anthony Denison, Archdeacon of Taunton.

God forbid that I should not share in the loyal trustfulness that has been so beautifully expressed from this platform this morning as to the future of the Church of England. But if we are to be trustful, we must be careful to look the whole danger in the face; and to say that there is no danger is, I think, such a paradox as hardly any man will venture to put his hand to. The world is too powerful, both in its uneducated, and, aye more, in its educated class, at this day against the Church for us to be able to utter words only of self-gratulation and complacency. I have some right to say these things in regard to the University, because it is now very nearly sixty years since I took my degree at Oxford, and I have been very much mixed up with the fortunes and the lives and the acts of very many of those who have taken a very prominent part in the movements of the last forty years. And when I look at the Universities now, although I am not going to deny that there is a vast deal which I bless and thank God for, I do not forget all the infidelity that is in them. But I would rather have the sharp current running through the Universities, and producing so many happy results, than have the stagnation of the waters of the time during which I was there. But still there is a danger. We must not shut our eyes. It is very dear to hear such hopeful words spoken by those who know the state of the Universities far better than I can. But still it is impossible to deny that the danger is very great, especially from those who call themselves the educated classes of this great country. I have no fear of the uneducated classes. I have the utmost fear of the great masses of those people who appeal to nothing but the intelligence of the human mind. There was a time when none of these things had come into conflict, or about which there was no disturbance in the Universities. They were the homes—one of the great signs of the Christian land—they were the homes of theology. They claim to be the homes of theology now. But are they, in the same sense in which they were fifty years ago? No. I say the civil power of England has placed these homes in ruins. I can use no other words than to say that the homes of the Universities—the home of theology—are in ruins. And then

what further? With the home the shrine is in ruins; because, whatever may be said of the scholarship of the present day, I confess I have very little faith in it. It is not to be found anywhere in England now, as in the early years of this century. I believe there is a good deal of crude and disputatious philology; but it is a great mistake to suppose that philology is scholarship, or anything like it. I would venture to say, in passing, that we have a most memorable instance of what philology can do *versus* scholarship in the Revised Version. Can anything be more absurd than to give a test by tenses and particles in dealing with the Greek of the New Testament? It is the most absurd thing I ever heard of in my life, and so I may be justified in saying that the shrine of theology is in ruins. What is the shrine of theology? the combined Greek and Latin languages; and what has become of Greek and Latin in England? I appeal to my friends—perhaps it is rather impertinent to speak of Cambridge—whether in Cambridge Greek is not to be given up. I do not know how far it has escaped my excellent friends, but there is a word which the Greeks applied to those who did not know the Greek language—βάρβαροι. And then for the Latin language—the foundation of all the taste of the English mind—what is becoming of it? Now I hold in my hand a curious document. We have many people who set up to give us new methods of instruction in England. I have watched them for the last fifty years, and the longer I watch the less I trust them. I have no faith in them at all. I hold in my hand a very curious document. It was given me the other day by a dear friend of mine in Taunton, into whose hands it was placed by one of her Majesty's inspectors, and who professed to instruct children in Latin. Now here it is. Standard VII., Latin nouns and meanings—*anima*, animal; *dicare*, to speak; *vocare*, to sing; *aedis*, a building; *turnere*, to swell; *pretium*, prize. Here it is—Standard VII. And that is to supply all the failure and all the deficiency in the teaching of the Latin tongue. I wish it may.

[The Archdeacon begs to add that he has since been informed, upon best authority, that the card is a publisher's card, and not an Inspector's. He would suggest that the Inspectors should look a little more carefully after the publishers.]

The Rev. A. M. W. Christopher, Rector of St. Aldate's, Oxford.

I venture to speak as a Cambridge man who has worked in Oxford for the last twenty-four years, and has in that time known many of several successive generations of undergraduates. I have known something of both Universities for more than forty years, for it was in 1843 I first visited Oxford as one of the Cambridge "Eleven." I cannot take a desponding view of the present state of Oxford; there is, of course, a dark side, but there is also a bright side. I believe that the influence of spiritual religion is on the increase both at Oxford and at Cambridge. It would make those who are interested in the Universities thank God and take courage, to look back a hundred-and-fifteen years, and remember the six undergraduates of St. Edmund Hall, who were at that time expelled from the University of Oxford, for no other fault than that of meeting in each other's rooms for extempore prayer. It was then that the celebrated preacher, George Whitefield, of Pembroke College, wrote and printed his remonstrance, addressed to the Vice-Chancellor of the University, in which he said, "As judgment hath unhappily begun, as it were, at the very house of God, it is to be hoped, that as some have been expelled for extempore praying, we shall hear of some few others of a contrary stamp being expelled for extempore swearing, which by all impartial judges must undoubtedly be acknowledged to be the greater crime of the two." What a contrast is the state of things now! Meetings in the rooms of undergraduates at Oxford and Cambridge, for the reading of the Holy Scriptures, and prayer, are a common thing. I rejoiced to hear the Regius Professor of Divinity allude so kindly to the mission in Oxford last November of Messrs. Moody and Sankey. I can assure Dr. Ince that the number of undergraduates who listened attentively to dear Mr. Moody's Gospel address, on the last evening of the mission, was much nearer a thousand than five hundred. If the difficulties in Oxford had been tenfold what they are, and the number of unbelievers had been ten times greater, it would still have been our duty to say in faith to our Father, as did an ancient King of Judah, "O our God, we have no might against this great company that cometh against us, neither know we what to do; but our eyes are upon Thee." Not that I

regard sceptics in Oxford as enemies, but rather as mistaken friends. It is encouraging to our faith to bear in mind that the heart most interested in the subject before us is that of the Lord Jesus Christ Himself, who is present in the midst of us to bless us in considering it. The practical question is, What can those who do not live at Oxford or Cambridge do to promote a larger supply from the Universities of suitable candidates for the ministry of the Gospel in our Church? Surely they may use and promote to the utmost intercessory prayer, that the God of all grace will pour out His Holy Spirit on our Universities. Nothing but this will raise up a sufficient number of self-renouncing servants of Christ to evangelise Africa, India, and China. What a fruitful result of this Church Congress it would be if the members of it were to regard themselves as a prayer union between one Congress and the next, daily to beseech God to pour out His Holy Spirit on our Church and Universities. By this only can real union be brought about on the foundation of truth. Then we must remember that some of the most zealous and useful undergraduates have been converted when away from the University. This was the case with the president of a boat club in a college at Cambridge—the most popular man in his college—who is now living and working for Christ amongst his fellow undergraduates. We must bear in mind that many young men know too well the misery which sin has produced in themselves and in others, and would be thankful to know the Lord Jesus as a Saviour from the dominion, love, and practice of sin. Surely these would trust and love Him if they realised that He is "the same yesterday, to-day, and for ever," and is saying daily to each in love, "My grace is sufficient for thee, for My strength is made perfect in weakness." A higher standard of devotion to the service of the Lord Jesus Christ must be set before our young men, if we would have the self-sacrificing missionaries we require for the heathen abroad, and the devoted curates needed for our large parishes at home. Young men might, under God's blessing, be helped to attain this standard by reading a half-crown book entitled, *Abide in Christ, being Thoughts on the Blessed Life of Fellowship with the Son of God*, by the Rev. Andrew Murray, published by Nisbet. It is of great importance to promote amongst young men the study of Christian Evidences. The last book an ordinary young man would read, without special encouragement, would be a book on Christian Evidences. Might not some of those Christians, to whom God has given the talent of wealth, found scholarships in colleges at Oxford and Cambridge, to be given to those who pass the best examination in Christian Evidences? How useful books on the Evidences of Christianity may be to young men may be illustrated by the following fact. The present bishop of an English diocese, a distinguished and learned Oxford man, told me many years ago that, when he was an undergraduate at Oxford, he had been preserved from unbelief by reading the late George Stanley Faber's *Difficulties of Infidelity*, a valuable book, which, with another by the same able writer, entitled, *The Difficulties of Romanism*, has been allowed to fall out of print. What a joy it would be to some present to save a deluded young man from the catastrophe of joining the Church of Rome by leading him to consider with a candid mind the difficulties of Romanism. Much may be done to fortify the minds of young men coming up to the University against unbelief by encouraging them to read some of a superior series of *Present Day Tracts*, written by very able and learned men, and published by the Religious Tract Society at fourpence each. I will read the titles of five of them:—*The Historical Evidence of the Resurrection of Jesus Christ from the Dead*, by Prebendary Row; *Christ the Central Evidence of Christianity*, by Principal Cairns; *Agnosticism, A Doctrine of Despair*, by Dr. Porter, President of Yale College, U.S.A.; *The Mosaic Authorship and Credibility of the Pentateuch*, by the Dean of Canterbury; and *The Authenticity of the Four Gospels*, by Dr. Wace. It is too often the case that young men come up to the Universities knowing little of the Holy Scriptures, and nothing at all of Christian Evidences. Can we be surprised that they take up the unbelief with which they are sure, in some way or another, to come in contact, either at the University or somewhere else? After all, the great preservative of a young man from error is the prayerful study of the Word of God. A very learned Oxford man was only a few years ago brought out of much unbelief by putting aside all other books, and, as far as possible, the remembrance of their contents, and shutting himself up with the four Gospels to read them as if he was reading them for the first time in his life. A dignitary of the Church still living—a Bampton lecturer—when, at Oxford nearly fifty years ago, he saw one friend after another join the Church of Rome, determined to consult no more friends and no more uninspired books, but to give himself up to the study of St. Paul's Epistles, to see if he could find therein the doctrines which had carried off his friends to Rome. His

conclusion was that St. Paul did not teach them, and from that time those dangerous errors had no influence whatever upon the mind of that able and most useful clergyman. What God has done in one by means of His Word He can do in another.

The Rev. E. S. TALBOT, Warden of Keble College, Oxford.

I SUPPOSE those of us resident in the University addressing the Congress this morning are to try and do two things—to help you who are mostly outside it to get some glimpse of the real state of things, and also to suggest to you some way in which you may help us. I will try to say a word upon both these points to you. First, as to the state of life and thought within the University, about which one is often asked in the country. I always feel inclined to begin any answer I make to them by saying—You will judge of what we are best by what you see around yourselves. Life in Oxford is very like life in the world elsewhere, and I do not very much doubt that unbelief in Oxford is very similar to unbelief as you find it in magazines, and in drawing-rooms, and in dinner parties, and in every *stratum* of life. In Oxford and outside it expresses itself more boldly and plainly, and with more of what is called cultivation than it did. And so the characteristics of modern life when it enters Oxford are much the same as its characteristics elsewhere. Take, for example, such a matter as athletics; they are not confined to the Universities. They are to be seen everywhere, and no one can measure the difference made between life fifty years ago in Oxford and that of to-day, if they do not take into account the amount of time, energy, and interest which is absorbed by athletics. In the same way the activity and bustle in the world outside—the hurry of multiplied work and organisation—this enters into Oxford too, and we have societies, secular, sacred, social, and literary, for graduates and undergraduates, and the great fear of all of us is to be asked, "Will you come to another meeting?" or, "Will you join another society?" In this kind of things you see a likeness between Oxford and the world outside, and I believe any one who is trying to get a measure of the state of things in Oxford must try to realise in this way what Mr. Herbert Spencer would call the "environment of our work." If you try to contrast the Oxford of 1830 with Oxford of the present day, you must not think merely of what religion was then and is now, but you must try to get a picture of the whole life. And when you do that, you will find that one of our main difficulties in Oxford, as surely (to repeat myself once more) in the world outside, comes in a great measure out of one of the healthiest and best features of our time. I mean this, that so much comes forward to challenge men's interest and allegiance in the name of what is good, and what is true. The instinct in young men's hearts for what is good and what is true is, perhaps, as strong as ever; but religion in its simple and direct form monopolises the appeal to that instinct less than formerly, and the appeal reaches men from a variety of forms of thought and work which seem to them to be independent of Christainity. In seems to me that we hardly realise enough, what is so important in this connection, that the characteristic of the present day is that we live in an age which is at once critical and constructive. We have to spend our strength in defending the old truths against criticism, just when we want every atom of it to possess ourselves, in our Lord's name, of the manifold forms of life and thought which a constructive age puts out, and to prove that they are in their true nature Christian in spirit and principle. And so it follows that much of this latter work is imperfectly done, and what should be the instruments and handmaids of Christian truth become its rivals, or at least seem to be independent of it. Then what follows? These things attract and engross men, this or that project, *e.g.*, of social, or economical, or political improvement, lays hold of their enthusiasm. They see that the men who are pressing it on are good and true and earnest; they do not see the relation of it to the Faith of Christianity. And so they are alienated from this last, or at least preoccupied against interest in it. We are familiar with this in the instance of science. But it is true of other things besides science, that they see not so much enemies as counter attractions; and that in regard to them, men are atttacted by a claim which they respond to as rightful, and then fail to see the harmony between what attracts them and Christian Faith. We ourselves, the older people, often find it very difficult to put together the relations between the central truths and all other forms of work and life and thought in the present day. But we have seen our way after a little time, and a

little experience, sufficiently to know that it can be partly done, and will be in God's time fully done. This is very hard for a young man, and you cannot be surprised if many of your earnest men do for a time keep in abeyance from belief and from devotion. What we have to do is to try and encourage them by showing them our sympathy for all that is good in the things they take up, and we should assist them, in our intercourse and sermons, and so forth, to try and bring home to their minds the real connection between Christian faith and all the manifold corollaries which the Christian faith governs. I shall not have time to touch the other point except by a word. I wish to add to what has been said about the duties of parents. Those who have a son or sons to be sent up should remember and prepare their sons to understand that they are not going up to a home of religious training and influence, as aforetime was the case when a college was true to its idea; but rather that they are going out into a little world; and that their religion must be, in a certain sense, aggressive—that is, they must be prepared to bear their part in maintaining the cause of faith and goodness in the open field. Tell them before they come to the University, "You will find many men, Dons and ungraduates, working and thinking and striving for what is good. Mind you take part and help them; mind you strengthen their hands. You will find efforts for good in the University and Colleges; find such out and join in with some of them; in chapel, be of those who join in the responses, and give heart to the College services." Finally, one word as to a way in which many can help. The intercessions of Church people have grown fuller and more systematic. May we not ask that many will include in them a suffrage for our Univerisites, "that in these, and other places more especially dedicated to God's honour and service, true religion and wholesome learning may for ever flourish and abound."

Sir John Conroy, Bart., Arborfield Grange, Reading.

I HOPE that I may be excused for referring to what has recently been done by the members of my own old college—Christ Church—as having a distinct bearing on the subject of discussion this morning. When I was an undergraduate, fourteen years ago, I am quite sure that no member of "the House" would have proposed that we should form an association of graduates and undergraduates to raise money to work a mission in East London, and I appeal to my own undergraduate contemporaries, of whom several are here present, and I also appeal to older generations of University men, and specially, if I may do so with all respect, to the Venerable Archdeacon of Taunton, whether during his most brilliant University career—fifty years ago—any one could have suggested such a mission scheme, and if such a scheme had been suggested, whether it would have been possible to have carried it out? As many here are aware, within the last few years this has been done. It is quite true that some of the old members of Christ Church have provided the money to build the mission house, but the whole annual cost of defraying the expenses of the mission is borne by the undergraduates and resident graduate members of "the House." We all know that men do not usually put their hands into their pockets, especially when, as in the present instance, many of those pockets are very empty, unless they are thoroughly in earnest. I therefore think the fact of the existence of the Christ Church mission is the best possible proof that amongst the members of the House there are many who do not believe that Christianity is "an exploded and dying superstition."

The Ven. William Emery, Archdeacon and Canon of Ely; Permanent Secretary of Church Congresses.

I HAVE two announcements to make, but not in my ten minutes. One is in respect of the Congress of next year. The Consultative Committee which met in July received two invitations, one from Carlisle, and the other from the diocese of Sodor and Man. They were both equally emphatic in their desire for the Congress to visit them, but after the very greatest consideration it was thought that the land journey would

be best in 1884; and, therefore, I have, as the permanent secretary, to announce that Carlisle is the place selected for next year, and in the name of the committee, to invite all whom God shall spare, as far as possible, to come to Carlisle. The next announcement is to ask you to remember what I said yesterday, that we are taking the utmost pains not only to produce a perfect report, but to bring it out in proper time, and we hope that as many as possible will give an order for the report. Now, I begin my ten minutes. With your lordship's permission I wish to speak upon one portion of University work and University life, which has not yet been touched upon. I feel in rather an odd position in doing it, because I have to confess that the part of the work which I wish to speak upon has not until lately, very lately—and I can scarcely now say that it has—received my own approval. We have heard a great deal this morning about the work of the Church in connection with the colleges and the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge, but we live in times of great progress, and, of course, the Church is bound to consider any new difficulties which fall upon her in these times. We have now married fellows in our colleges, and we are getting quite a different system in the Universities, and a different set of inhabitants in consequence partly thereof. And of late there is a new kind of student who has been introduced into the Universities, both at Cambridge and at Oxford, upon whom the Church and the religious life of the nation in the future must greatly depend. I find that in Oxford there are two ladies' colleges—the Somerville, and the Lady Margaret's Hall. I find in Cambridge there is the Newnham College and the Girton College. I am told that all these are full. I am informed that the lady students are most energetic in their work. I am told that they are preparing themselves to take their proper and useful position in educated society, and in the educational work of the country. Now, then, it seems to me a most solemn point for the Church to consider as to her duty towards these new institutions, and what she has to do in respect of these in promoting in them sound learning and religious education. Contemplate a few years hence, and suppose a number of lady educational institutions of the country filled with these students, and the various high schools of the country and boarding-schools and others superintended by them, and that they have not received in Oxford and Cambridge what we should call a true religious grounding of education. What are you to expect with respect to women of the next generation? Now, taking Oxford; one of these—Lady Margaret's Hall—is, I believe, what we should call a Church foundation; the other is an open one. I suppose at Somerville College young ladies—if I may use the phrase—of all persuasions go there. At Newnham and at Girton it is the same. At Newnham I have had special personal reasons for inquiry, and I find that of course there is no religious test. It is open to all, and you will find it is a most progressing college. There are the most devoted teachers, and the utmost enthusiasts in education; but you will find at Newnham young ladies of all opinions, and you will find—I was going to say—young ladies of no opinions. You will find young students who never go to worship. Now I say it is a very dangerous thing that we should have such an institution—at any rate I think so—and that the Church should not have in Cambridge her own institution, where the Church parents may feel that they can send their daughters to get the full advantages of University education, without running the danger of some of their time—it may be a great deal of their time—being taken up, not only in the discussions—the unhappy discussions—of the difficulties amongst Christians, but the still worse discussions in connection with scepticism and agnosticism and unitarianism. These discussions, I know, have taken place, and these discussions are taking place, and though there are, as I say, in these institutions, both at Newnham and Girton, those who are thoroughly in earnest and personally religious, and anxious also to give a Church religious idea to their students, yet at the same time, from the constitution of the colleges, it cannot but be that there is a very great danger to the young ladies staying there that they may have their faith uprooted, and that they may be sent forth into the world, not with the sober religious feeling of Church of England people, but those new-fangled notions which, please God, in time they may get rid of, but which, before they get rid of them, they may in part communicate to others. What I wish to urge, my friends, upon this point is this—not in the least degree to say one word against those who have been so energetic, and as some men consider, so wise and so earnest in their efforts to do justice to the women of England in the way of education, and bring to them the full advantage of the Universities—to consider, seriously, churchmen, churchwomen and Church parents of England, whether it is not time for the Church deliberately to take up the question, and to do for their daughters what they are now trying to do for their sons; to protect them during the time of the formation and the strengthening

of their reasoning powers, as far as possible, from unhappy disputes and discussions concerning religion, and to bring them up in what I believe is the best way, both for this world and the next, in the sober, truthful, religious, and Apostolic branch of Christ's Church established in this country.

The Right Hon. Sir John Mowbray, M.P.

I hope the lady members of this Congress will not think me wanting in gallantry if I say I appear here, rather as representative of the young men and the old men who alone constitute the convocation who send me to Parliament, rather than those coming constituents of some future generation, who at the present moment have no vote given to them by Act of Parliament, and who have to obtain the sanction of Parliament before they can do so. I, therefore, do not propose to follow the venerable archdeacon into the controversy which he has raised by his last speech. I perfectly agree with him, that if young ladies are to be brought up to the University, they require, and should have as much as possible, all the benefit of religious education. But whether it is wise and politic, and a judicious thing, where several thousands of young men are associated together in study and instruction, to bring up to such a University a number of ladies is a very grave question, upon which I for a moment do not desire to express an opinion; but upon one matter the venerable archdeacon has pronounced a very decided opinion; he seems to regard with some satisfaction the multiplication of married Fellows. I believe the multiplication of married Fellows will have a very serious and injurious effect on the tutorial instruction given in the colleges of the University. It takes from the colleges their domestic character. It will draw the students from many associations which have been of great value, not in the lecture room only, but in the afternoon walk, and the occasional converse in the evening. But this is a controversial subject. It is not the business of a member of Parliament to speak dogmatically on the inner life of the University. He has to speak of it out of doors, but I may, perhaps, be allowed to mention the conclusions I have drawn from the debate. First of all, the tone has been very hopeful from Cambridge, from Mr. Appleton and Mr. Welldon. From Canon King and from the Warden of Keble College we have heard a very hopeful account of the state of affairs in the University of Oxford; and I have also been pleased to hear the testimony of my friend, Sir John Conroy, as to the efforts of Christ Church, which have originated within the house itself, and have been entirely supported by funds derived from the house itself. I draw a very hopeful conclusion from the testimony we have had to-day of the work going on in the Universities, but at the same time do not let us be too sanguine. The changes wrought by the Legislature in the last thirty years have only begun to take effect since last October. They have not taken full effect yet, and we cannot fully anticipate what will be the full effect of these changes. The second conclusion which gives me ground for hope is, the language adopted by Mr. Welldon, and which is a true view of the case, and that is, that if the education of the Universities is to be continued—as it always has been in time past—a religious education, it will be carried on by the Church. It is the Church, and the Church alone, that can do the work. It is the Church which must be prepared to come to the front in everything. What do we see?—that these colleges of Keble and Selwyn were founded by churchmen in memory of churchmen. What is the last great effort of the Church? that Library intended to hand down the memory of Dr. Pusey; and is there anything like that done by any other denomination? Have the Roman Catholics, or any other Nonconformist denomination, done anything like it? I will now allude to the words of the Archdeacon of Taunton, and I quite sympathise with his views, both as to the past, and the state of scholarship at the present moment. If scholarship is represented by the inspector, and by the specimen the venerable archdeacon has quoted, I say Good-bye to all scholarship in this country. At the same time, perhaps my friend and I belong to a generation which, perhaps, takes rather too gloomy a view of the present prospect of affairs. There was, some forty years ago, a time to which I can look back with great pleasure, when the position of the Church of England seemed bright beyond all hope and expectation. No doubt in 1835 to 1845, during the Oxford movement, there were greater hopes of the Church of England than there had been for some centuries, and we thought the whole communion was to be regenerated and affected by it. From the day of the secession of Dr. Newman, the Church has been reeling under the blow. That was indeed a blow to many men of our generation, and

perhaps they have not even recovered from the gloomy effect of that blow. But I thoroughly believe that the Church is now beginning to recover from it, and the hopeful view taken to-day makes me hope and trust that it may be so, for it is a brighter one generally than that which has been taken by my venerable friend the archdeacon. There is one other thing, and that is, that whatever influence the Church has in the Universities will depend upon what influence it exerts on the nation. There can be no doubt that the fathers and mothers who send their sons to be trained will be those who influence the Universities; and when I see the influence the Church has shown—the life and vigour it has shown only this week by the gathering here, and the interest taken in the discussions, and the number of people who assembled at the working men's meeting to listen to the bishops of the Church of England—I see from all of that a very hopeful view of the future, and believe that the Church is stronger in the nation—that the English Church is stronger among the English people, and that she will in future maintain her hold, as in times past, upon the English Universities.

The Rev. T. G. Headley, Manor House, Petersham.

My friend, Dr. French, the Bishop of Lahore, has told you in this hall, that apostolic men, burning with zeal for Christ, are wanted for foreign missions; and after what you have just heard from the speaker on this platform as to the want of religious faith or belief in the Universities, it is evident that apostolic men burning with zeal for Christ, and "inflamed with fire from heaven above," are also wanted at home. But yet it must be remembered that even the apostles themselves were divided and opposed to one another as to what was the true faith. And it is likewise a fact that the Churches are to the present day also divided and opposed to one another; therefore the vital question which the Universities are asking the Church to answer is—What is the true faith? And since, at a preliminary meeting to arrange for the holding of this Congress, Mr. W. H. Smith, M.P., said it was the glory of the Church of England that it did not exclude men who held the true faith, however differently they expressed it; and the President, in his opening address, said, "We have all come here to speak our minds"; therefore, as the Congress does not shrink from burning questions, and it is the mission of the Church to teach the truth, I feel privileged to ask, What is the true faith? For it is a matter of history that our Master was condemned to be sacrificed as a blasphemer by a proud Church for having dared to reveal the gospel of glad tidings, that God was the loving and merciful Father of all men, without respect of nations or persons, and not the Father of a sect or nation only; and, therefore, you ought to give a fair hearing to all who would address you in Christ's name, lest in refusing it you repeat the sin of those who condemned Christ to be crucified as a blasphemer. What then is the true faith? For as between the Church and the Universities this must be the burning question for the Church and for the Universities. *What then is* the true faith according to the teaching of the Church? And what is the true faith according to the teaching of Christ in the Gospels? The Christian Church condemns the Jews as murderers, for having shed the blood of Jesus. Then, if the Jews were murderers, must not the Christian Churches be slanderers, whilst they call that evil deed good, as they do in their doctrine of Atonement, which teaches that God Himself required the blood of Christ as a sacrifice? Surely such an evil doctrine of Atonement must be the cause of Shakespeare telling us that—

> "In religion
> There's no damned error, but some sober brow
> Will bless it, and approve it with a text."

Whilst the late Lord Beaconsfield asserts, in the life of George Bentinck, that in consequence of the Church teaching this evil doctrine of Atonement, Judas Iscariot ought to be and is the chief saint of the Church. And since it is a matter of history that all the Churches denounce one another, more or less, as anti-Christian, it is impossible to come to any other conclusion than that the fundamental doctrine of Atonement, common to them all, is not the true faith. Then, for the sake of Christ, for the sake of the Jews, for the sake of the world hungering and thirsting for the true

faith, let the Church of England (in the spirit of St. Paul, in Romans ix. 3) put away the sanguinary doctrine of Atonement as evil and anti-Christian. Whilst if it is denied that the Church teaches this sanguinary doctrine of the Atonement as the true faith, then I appeal to the Christians in this Congress to save me from being boycotted (as I am to this hour) by ministers of the Church because I refuse to teach it, and dare to expose it as evil and anti-Christian. And it evidently must be evil and anti-Christian, because it not only images a good God as Satan, and an evil deed as good, but it makes good persons, who teach it, evil also; as they then justify themselves in condemning those who refuse to believe this evil doctrine as evil persons whom it is doing God service to condemn and cast out of the Church, as their predecessors condemned Christ. And thus they condemn Christ afresh in condemning His servants. And meanwhile the pulpits are closed to the preaching the truth of Christ crucified. But I appeal to the people to open them :—

> "Purge out false doctrine, let it die the death,
> Then on the Church may work with unabated breath."

TOWN HALL,

THURSDAY MORNING, OCTOBER 4TH.

The Right Rev. the BISHOP OF BEDFORD in the Chair.

SUNDAY TEACHING FOR THE CHILDREN OF THE UPPER, MIDDLE, AND LOWER CLASSES.

PAPERS.

The Rev. FIELD FLOWERS GOE, Rector of St. George's, Bloomsbury.

BELIEVING, as I do, that the appropriation of one day in every seven for the purposes of religion is not merely an ecclesiastical institution, but also a Divine command, too great a boon to mankind to have any author but One, I feel that the future life of a child greatly depends on the manner in which Sunday is presented to him.

It is a day given to us by Him of whom it is written, "God is Love"; it is given to us by Him, because He loves us, and wishes us to be happy. He knows wherein our happiness consists. We are happy in proportion as we know Him, and please Him; and the right observance of Sunday influences the whole religious life and character. "To serve God truly all the days of our life," is, according to the Catechism, the grand lesson of Sunday.

Accordingly, in considering the subject of "Sunday Teaching," I would assign a high place to teaching *by example*. Let the manner of those to whom the care of children on Sunday is entrusted be such as to produce the impression that Sunday is the happiest day of the week. Let children see cheerful faces, and hear gentle tones on that day. Let *privilege* be more prominent than *prohibition*. Let the child be led to

regard Sunday in the light in which holy George Herbert represents it: "Oh! day, most calm, most bright, the fruit of this, the next world's bud." In this respect, perhaps, the children of laymen in the upper and middle classes, have an advantage over the children of the clergy. In clerical families, more particularly in large parishes, there is sometimes on Sunday an atmosphere of bustle, anxiety, and unrest, inseparable perhaps from the many arduous cares of the parents on that day, but still calculated to act unfavourably on the children. To the layman, on the other hand, Sunday is what it was designed to be—the day of rest; and to the layman engaged in business all the week, perhaps in some locality distant from his residence, Sunday is more than this. It is the one day on which he can cultivate the affections of his children, and manifest the interest which he feels in their religious welfare. On that day, at any rate, if he be a truly Christian man, he can contribute much to the happiness of his children. He can do much to render God's house, God's book, and God's day attractive to them. Parental influence, wisely exerted on Sunday, oftentimes invests religion with a charm of early associations, which the lapse of time cannot destroy. Apart from dogmatic teaching, incalculable good is done by those who succeed in enlisting the sympathies, the prejudices, the tender associations of childhood on the side of religious habits. I shall now offer some observations bearing upon the functions of those on whom the Sunday teaching of children mainly devolves—viz., parents, clergy, and voluntary teachers in a Sunday school or otherwise.

1. *Parents*. Sunday teaching for children should begin at home. The *family* is the natural mould of character, the divinely constituted nursery of the Church. However earnest the clergy and the teachers of Sunday schools may be in promoting religious teaching, all will be comparatively unavailing if the parents are not anxious for the spiritual welfare of their children. Clergy and teachers may be the help of parents, but they cannot be the substitute for them. God holds parents responsible for the instruction of their children; and they sustain a definite relation to them which they cannot hand over to others. Trite though these remarks are, it seems to me that they need to be repeated. There is a tendency in the State, and to some extent in the Church also, to take us all up and do for us in such sort that personal action and individual responsibility are in danger of being overlooked. Accordingly, I doubt the wisdom of establishing Sunday schools for the children of the middle and upper classes. Sunday schools are at the best but a partial remedy for the apathy and incompetence of parents, aggravated a thousandfold, in the case of the *poor*, by wretched dwellings and overcrowding. But where parents have received a sufficient education and can provide comfortable dwellings for their families, why should they weaken the parental tie by committing the Sunday teaching of their children to strangers? An able writer remarks that, "a parent who has right views of his relationship and his responsibility, will say, 'I may commit the *general* education of my children to others, but not their religious training. This is too momentous to be entrusted out of my own hands. Others may be ignorant, negligent, or erroneous. I must see, therefore, to this matter myself. I cannot transfer my relation, and I will not transfer my exertions. God will require my children at my hands, and as I cannot reckon with Him by proxy, so I will not work by proxy.'" To this it may

be added that a large proportion of the children of the middle and upper classes are sent away from home to public schools and boarding schools at an early age, which renders it the more important that the Sundays of a child's life, prior to his going to school, should be so spent as to strengthen home influence. When Napoleon asked Madame Campan what the French nation most wanted, her reply was—"Mothers;" and a prison chaplain has stated, as the result of his experience, that "the last thing forgotten in all the recklessness of dissolute profligacy, is the prayer or hymn taught by a mother's lips, or uttered at a father's knee; and where there seems to have been any pains bestowed even by one parent to train up a child aright, there is in general more than ordinary ground for hope."

It may not be out of place to allude here to the many helps of which parents may avail themselves in order to make their Sunday teaching pleasant and useful to children. In the present day, more than at any previous period in the Church's history, the pen of the accomplished writer and the pencil of the skilful artist are laid under contribution for this purpose. The Notes of Lessons on Bible and Prayer Book, published by the Church of England Sunday School Institute, are as suitable for the use of parents as for Sunday school teachers, and such a book as Dr. Alexander Macleod's *Talking to the Children*, may well be studied as a model for those who would win the ear of the young for the great truths of the Gospel. The writings of Canon Tristram and other travellers in the East give a vividness and reality unknown before to Bible lands and scenes. The need of such helps as these to make Biblical stories *real* to young minds is illustrated by a Bible class scholar, a servant girl of whom I have somewhere read. She heard her mistress talking about Jerusalem, in connection with a proposed visit to it. "What!" she asked in surprise, "is there really such a place as Jerusalem, that people can go to now?" "Why, yes, have you not often heard about it in your class?" "Oh! yes, but I did nôt know it was real; I always thought it was something religious!"

2. *The Clergy.* The care of the *lambs*, as well as of the sheep, of Christ's fold, is included in the sacred commission, and, by the rubric at the end of the Catechism, the curate of every parish is directed diligently upon Sundays, openly, in the church, to instruct and examine the children of his parish. The main energies of the clergy on Sunday should, I think, be given to their public functions, preaching the Word of God, administering the Sacraments, and conducting the worship of the people. These duties require, not only physical strength and spiritual zeal, but also mental elasticity. And therefore it is much to be regretted when, owing to the inadequacy of the teaching staff, a clergyman is obliged to teach a class in the Sunday school, unless, of course, there be a large staff of clergy. But a clergyman cannot be more fitly and usefully employed on Sunday than conducting children's services, and in catechising and preaching to children. Where the clerical staff allows of it, it is well not only to catechise children and preach to them in church on Sunday afternoon, but also to have a children's service in the morning, carried on simultaneously with the usual Church service, in the schoolroom, or other suitable room, at which the clergyman is surpliced, and some of the children are formed into a choir. The service should be short, taken from the Prayer Book, suitable hymns chosen, and a sermon preached.

The time should not exceed an hour. Sunday teaching, as given by the clergy, should aim at making the church service popular and attractive to children, so that as they grow up, they shall have no wish to exchange it for that of other communions; it should be such as to teach them reverence in their behaviour; it should encourage them to take an active, hearty, and intelligent part in the responses; and it should give them sound instruction in the Bible, in the Prayer Book, and the Catechism. Perhaps some of my younger brethren may sometimes be tempted to complain that they have more than their share of the work of teaching children. But, I believe that, in view of their future usefulness and efficiency, no amount of pains and labour bestowed on this part of their work is too great. The best teacher, whether of old or of young, is he who best succeeds in making hard things easy; and it is in the teaching of children that the art is most thoroughly acquired. I hope that the time is coming when the clergy will be as much ashamed to confess that they do dot know how to preach to children, as that they cannot preach the ordinary sermon to a general congregation. A young clergyman has one advantage over his elders, in this respect, that it is not so very long since he was himself a child. John Foster, in his essay "On a man's writing memoirs of himself," says, "I have just been observing several children of eight or ten years old; and while observing, I attempted, but without success, to recollect what I was at that age. The life that we then had now seems almost as if it could not have been our own. When we go back to it in thought and endeavour to recall the interests which animated it, they will not come." But, however true this may be in the case of middle-aged and elderly people, surely it would be mere affectation in a young clergyman of three and twenty thus to disclaim all sympathy with and recollection of the days of his childhood.

But the duties of the clergy are not confined to the instruction which they give to children personally; they have to show others how to teach on a Sunday. The most usual way of doing this, and a most useful way it is, is that of conducting weekly Sunday school teachers' preparation classes. How to conduct these classes to the best advantage was the topic discussed at the Sunday School Institute's Conference at Lambeth in May last. Many excellent remarks were made on that occasion; but, assuming that the Institute's courses of lessons are adopted in the Sunday school, I should say that the conductor of the class would do wisely to give special attention to two points—the one, to show the teachers how to apply different methods of treatment to the same subject. Excellent as the courses provided by the Institute are, there is a certain monotony and sameness of treatment in some of them. But the same lesson may be taught in different ways, synthetically, analytically, topically, or in an expository form, and if a teacher understands how to vary the method of treatment, he can secure freshness and variety in his teaching. The other point specially to be aimed at is, to throw out such suggestions as may render the same lesson suitable for the younger as well as the older classes in the school.

The ordinary preparation class is intended to help Sunday school teachers, whose business it is, as a rule, to instruct the lower classes of children. But in parishes in which there is a large proportion of middle and upper class families, it might be of great utility to hold a weekly *mothers'* preparation class, the object of which should be to provide

mothers with suitable Sunday teaching for their children. Many mothers would, I think, gratefully avail themselves of the help which such a class would afford.

3. *Lay Teachers of Children on Sunday.* There seems no reason why the only Sunday teachers of children should be Sunday school teachers; and I think that among children of the middle and higher classes an important field of usefulness might be occupied by teachers not associated with any Sunday school. The parents of the lower classes, when they send their children to the Sunday school, rarely ask the question, who will be their teacher. They are glad to get the children out of the way for an hour or two, and are contented to leave the authorities of the school to decide that question. But, if we ascend in a social scale, we shall find not a few parents who, though desirous of some extraneous help in carrying on the religious education of their children, yet shrink from confiding them to the absolute discretion of the superintendent of the Sunday school. Now, in parishes where the population chiefly consists of middle and higher class people, I think that pious ladies and gentlemen, who have a talent for teaching, might do much good by throwing open their drawing-rooms for an hour on Sunday afternoon, and receiving the children of their well-to-do neighbours for instruction in religious knowledge.

The attention of the Sunday school teacher is mainly directed, and I think rightly so, to the children of working people. And it must be admitted that no department of Church work has been developed with greater rapidity during the last half century than that of Sunday school work. The publication of notes of lessons, the employment of qualified agents to visit the centres of population, giving addresses to teachers, and model lessons to children in the presence of teachers, and the encouragement afforded to teachers to improve themselves in religious knowledge, by means of examinations, have materially helped to raise the standard of attainment among teachers. This is a cause of devout thankfulness to God, when we consider that our teachers are said to number 200,000, and that Sunday by Sunday they are influencing more than two million children. But the question presses itself on the attention of churchmen, What is the actual value of our Sunday school teaching to the Church? Painful statistics have lately been published, showing how large a percentage of the inhabitants of our large towns absent themselves from church. People say, what are the Sunday schools doing? Ought they not by this time to be making a deeper impression on the non-church-going masses? It is certain that thousands of adults who have passed through our Sunday schools are living in utter neglect of public worship. It does not perhaps belong to my present subject to discuss the question, how to retain our elder scholars, though no subject is more important. But if we desire to have our Sunday teaching such as shall influence the whole after life of our scholars, two things at any rate should be borne in mind. The one is the ultimate end of Sunday teaching, which is the winning of the hearts of children to the love of Christ. It is often said that the business of teachers is to prepare children for confirmation. But this is not *fully* done by teaching them to repeat the Catechism. The promise of repentance toward God, and faith toward our Lord Jesus Christ, made for the infant by his sureties at his baptism, he is himself bound to perform when he comes to age. But many of our young

people, I fear, come before the bishop knowing very little of the great change implied in that promise. In proportion as the child is led to this change of heart and mind, the foundation of a Christian character is surely laid.

The other thing I would mention is, the importance of doing all that can be rightly done to make our Sunday schools *happy* places. Order, discipline, drill, attention to the superintendent's bell, and so forth, are doubtless necessary; so also is the well-prepared lesson. But the tone, the moral atmosphere of the school—let not these be overlooked. Let love rule all; let it shine in the teacher's face, let it speak in the tones of his voice. Let the child who is neglected, or ill-treated at home, who comes from a wretched home where the father drinks and swears, and the mother is dirty and fretful, turn to his Sunday school as to a true place of rest, as to an oasis in the desert; let him turn to his Sunday teacher as to his best friend. It is related of Whitfield that a child heard him preach on the love of God to men as displayed in the work of redemption. Soon afterwards the child sickened and died, and when dying he said, "I want to go to Mr. Whitfield's God." The more our Sunday teaching succeeds in thus winning the hearts of the young, the more abiding will be its results.

The Rev. R. W. Randall, All Saints', Clifton, Bristol.

The Congress seems to look upon me as specially the children's friend, for this is the third or fourth time that I have been asked to speak at a Church Congress about the religious education of children. It is the highest honour that could be conferred on me. I should be glad indeed, to think that I deserved it in any way. But it is a somewhat perilous honour to be asked to speak again on a subject on which I seem already to have said all that I have to say. It is true that this year the subject has been somewhat narrowed, and made more pointed and definite. We are to consider, not the general religious education of children, but the teaching of them on Sunday, and I have been asked to deal specially with the teaching of the children of the upper classes. I shall do my best to keep to my brief, as well as to be brief in what I say; but at the outset, let me say that I have very little faith in a Sunday teaching which is Sunday teaching only, and which is not carried on well into the week also, and that I do not believe in any broad distinction between the way of teaching the upper, middle, and the lower classes. As to the *practice* of teaching, it is to be feared that there is a very broad and a very lamentable difference between the upper and the lower classes. Definite provision is largely made in the scheme of parochial work for the teaching of the lower classes. There are Sunday schools, Sunday school teachers, fixed hours, a fixed place, something of a scheme of fixed subjects, something of order, regularity, arrangement, and system. I do not say whether or no these are all turned to the best account. The Sunday teaching of the lower classes is not the department of the subject that falls to me to-day. But something of plan and system there is in the teaching of them. In

many parishes there is no such provision for the teaching of the children of the upper classes. Beyond their own homes there is no place, no time, no teacher, no plan of religious teaching appointed for them. It seems to be supposed that they will receive all the religious teaching which they need in their own homes. Undoubtedly the home is the school above all others in which the child should learn all that it ought to know and believe to its soul's health. There the first prayers should be said, the first great truths of the faith learnt, the first pages of the Word of God heard and read, the first light of the knowledge of God, the first streaks of the glory of heaven, let into the young child's soul. There is no such training for after life as the training that is given in the Church that is in the house in each family. The noblest, the truest, the purest, the most saintly lives have been formed in the home. There must be hundreds here to-day to whom a father's teaching and a mother's tender care have been amongst the most blessed and hallowing influences of their lives; hundreds before whose mind the old home of the days of childhood still rises as the fairest of all shrines in which they learnt to know God and to draw near to Him. The truest religious teaching begins in the home—is still tenderly cared for, for the *girl* in advancing years under the same sheltering roof—for the *boy* advanced and enlarged in the school, and perfected in the University. So the young ones of our upper classes would be equipped for the real work of life, the service of God. Undoubtedly this is often the case. But is this fair ideal always realised? It is a common saying that what is everybody's business is nobody's business. This is eminently true in too many cases of the religious teaching of the upper classes. It is too often almost the most haphazard thing that exists. The parents think that the child will pick up its religion somehow; they trust to the school or to the home teacher for that more definite and orderly teaching which ought at least to have been begun by themselves. The schoolmaster, or the girl's governess, trusts to the parents' taking care that the child is taught its religion. Further on, as far as the young man is concerned, tutors at the University think that they may take it for granted that religious instruction has been given in the home and in the school. And so life runs on, and the teaching never comes, and the loss is felt all through life. Many an error in faith, many a perplexity of mind, many a wandering from the Church, many a fall into the misery of unbelief, many a moral shipwreck of a once noble soul, many an injury done, not only to the individual but to the Church, by a zeal misdirected through ignorance, many an aimless, useless, wasted, selfish life may be traced to the want of careful, systematic, devout, religious teaching in the opening years of the lives of those whom we have known and loved. What are we to learn from this? Surely that every one that has anything to do with a young child's life must take his own part and do his own duty—I would rather say claim his own privilege—in training God's children to do true work for Him. Parent and teacher, master and tutor, must one and all act as if the whole training of the young soul belonged to each of them. No one must leave to another what he can do himself. And, above all things, the Sundays must be seized, and used, and turned to real account in religious teaching. I am not forgetting that this is specially our subject. I do not believe that any religious teaching can succeed unless its *due* place is given

to the Sunday. I say its *due* place, for while it is most important for children that Sunday should be a bright and happy day (the very brightest and happiest in the whole week), it must be bright with the light that falls from heaven. As Keble says so well, the light of Easter Day must fall on it :—

> Enthronèd in thy sovereign sphere
> Thou shedd'st thy light on all the year ;
> Sundays by thee more glorious break,
> An Easter Day in every week.

The Sunday must be a marked day—marked as a day of worship and communion with God, a day specially given to God, and so a day marked as one on which to gain new knowledge of God—marked as to its books and amusements, and as to the things that we specially give our minds to. We have lost much of this. It must be regained, —regained in reality. It is not enough that the books which our children take up on Sunday should be novellettes, with a most remote allusion to religion. I have heard of such a story, of which the editor said to the author, "Could you not make it a religious story fit for Sunday Reading? Why should you not make these two lovers meet after church?" The lighter books to be read on the Sunday should at least be chosen so as to fall in with the graver teaching of the day. The children must be led to feel that Sunday is too precious to be idled away over romances, newspapers, periodicals and gossip. It must be stamped with the mark of a day that is to bring us nearer to God. And now, where, and how, and what, and by whom are the children to be taught?

1. *Where* are they to be taught? Most certainly in the church. Whatever teaching goes on at home, the house of God is the place above all others for the teaching of His children—the place where the child was baptized, the place of confirmation, and of first Communion—the place of that mingled awe and gladness with which the little one first came to take its part in public worship by the father's or the mother's side—the home of God's children in all ages of life, ready for them in the hours of joy, ready for them in the hours of sorrow. That is the place above all others to give power and force to all words about God, where the child seems more consciously to stand under the eye of God, and, like young Samuel, to wait more simply for what His voice shall say.

2. And by whom shall the children be taught? The Prayer Book answers, By the curate of the parish—by him to whom God has given the special care of the souls of these little ones. This is the rule of the Church, one of the very tenderest of all rules. By it the Church tries to make sure that, even if the home teaching is neglected, her minister at least shall do his part. At the very outset of the child's life the Church puts the child under the pastor's care, and prepares the pastor himself to become the known and trusted friend of all the after life.

3. And *how* is the curate to teach? By way of *public catechising*. There is no way of teaching like this. It is the Church's own way. The Congress must have meant me to say this. The older members of Congress know that I have said it over and over again. I shall go on saying it as often as they give me the chance. Perhaps this

is my last chance. If so, I say it all the more now. As the *orator* said that the first, second, and third requisite for telling oratory was Action, Action, Action; as the *saint* said that the first, second, and third grace in the saintly life was Humility, Humility, Humility; as the *politician* had but three exhortations to give to those who might become voters, Register, Register, Register; so I can only reiterate to the man who wants to give religious teaching to the upper classes, Catechise, Catechise, Catechise. I ought to have some experience of the value of catechising. More than fifty years ago I stood on a tottering form in your lordship's diocese to be catechised, sometimes, I am bound to say, shaking as much as the form shook. Thirty-six years ago I found myself set on suddenly to catechise in the same church where once I had been catechised, and I do not know whether I did not shake more then. For seventeen years I used to catechise village children, while your lordship's predecessor sat and listened. Perhaps I ought to have trembled more than I did then. For fifteen years now I have been catechising children of the upper classes, and, however I may have shaken myself, my faith in catechising has never been shaken. There is no way of teaching anything like so effective. And at least I may say of my faith that it has not been a faith without works, for I have read nearly every work on the subject that I could lay hands on.

4. And now we have put the curate in his proper place, the church. The children are gathered round him. There they are—the boys on one side, the girls on the other. They have begun their service with a few short prayers. They have sung a hymn. They have all repeated the Creed together. They are waiting, bright, expectant, eager. They love the Church. They love their own special service. They look forward to the teaching that is coming. Their fathers and mothers are there too, to listen—perhaps a sprinkling of older brothers and sisters. But *what* is the curate to teach? Well, everything that a Christian ought to know and believe to his soul's health—the *truth* that comes from God; the *law* that comes from God; the *grace* that comes from God—in a word, the *Catechism*, all that is in it; all that leads up to it; all that it leads up to; *Creed*, *Commandments*, *Prayers*, *Sacraments*, *Life;* the *Creed*, article by article, word by word; the *Commandments* in all their bearings, *especially the positive and relative duties* of life; all that has to do with *Prayer;* each petition of the Lord's Prayer; the nature of public and of private prayer; the different services of the Church; their division and arrangement; the meaning of Collects; the use of ceremonies; the people's part in the services; the nature of the Church; something, at least, of its history; the graces given in the Sacraments, the way to use them; life, its aims and objects, its blessings and dangers, its hopes and glorious future.

5. One point more, and I have done. How is all this to be done? It must be begun, continued, and ended in love—love for God, to whom these little ones are so dear; and then love for the children, tender, patient, simple love, full of real sympathy with children, quick and ready to understand them.

As to the manner of addressing the children, questioning them, bringing the lessons home to their hearts, there should be as much of change and variety as possible. Sometimes it is well to begin with a

very few words to the children themselves. More often it is well to go straight down the church to the parents and older people, and tell them what the children are to be taught on that particular Sunday, and ask the parents to help the children to carry out at home what they are taught to do. So during the catechising it is a good thing to pass from the children to the parents, and again from the parents to the children, sometimes speaking to one, sometimes to the other. Again, it is a very useful plan to tell the children of certain things which they should ask their parents or teachers at home—sometimes at the end of the catechising, sometimes in the middle of it. All this helps to bind parents and children together. It gives an opportunity for guiding the parents as to the things that they ought to be teaching at home, and for mentioning books of private prayer, of instruction in the faith, of meditation, of preparation for confirmation and first communion. It deepens in parents the sense of their responsibility for the teaching and training of their children. It often suggests to them how and what they should teach, or points out to them better methods of teaching. It helps to exalt and sanctify the whole influence of the home life. It fosters in the children's hearts that highest love which makes the child look to the parent as to one who is guarding the child for God's sake. And it leads both child and parent to realise the tender care of God in instituting the pastoral office. It binds pastor and people together. As the children find themselves loved, cared for, understood, and helped by their pastors in their earliest years, so in later life they turn readily to those same pastors. They look to them for advice and guidance as they grow in years. They reckon upon them as advisers in the perplexities and difficulties that beset them from time to time. They send for them in the trying hours of the last sickness, and welcome their prayers and ready aid in the moments of death. The sense of the blessing of God that comes through pastoral guidance once realised in the opening season of life lasts on to its very close.

And now does it seem that what I have said about the religious teaching of the upper classes on Sunday applies almost equally to all classes? Undoubtedly it does. It is the glory of the Church that in the things of God she knows no diffierence between class and class. As George Herbert has sung, "All equal are within the Church's gate." One rule is given by the Church for all her children. All are dear to her; all are the children of one Father; all bought by the Blood of one Lord; all sanctified by one Spirit. She has one plan for all. All are according to her order to meet in one sacred place, one house of God, the common home of all God's children; all are to be taught together by the same person; all brought up to believe the same sacred truths; all taught the same practices of the same religion. Let anyone act upon this plan of the Church, and gather all the children committed to his charge, with as many of the parents as can be drawn together, of all classes, for one common catechising, he will find that there is no need for separating them one from another. He may learn new lessons of faith for himself as he sees more and more plainly how the old truths, with a fresh and ever varying power of application, meet all the needs of human hearts, under all circumstances, and in all positions of life. It will be a delight to him to see how the bond of faith, and hope, and love holds rich and poor, high and low together. And these young

ones, as they kneel and pray together; as they raise their voices together in litanies, and in hymns of praise; as the poor learn something of the dangers and temptations of the rich; as the rich learn something of the trials and sorrows of the poor; as all together are taught to look to, to love, to adore one common Lord; as all learn to rejoice in the love of one common Father; as all are drawn nearer to that Father, and nearer to each other by the working within them of one and the same blessed Spirit, so one and all will learn something of the earthly side of that blessed communion of the saints which makes all who believe to be of one heart and of one soul.

ADDRESSES.

J. G. Talbot, Esq., M.P.

I am afraid that in the remarks I am about to make I may tread in some degree in the steps of those who have preceded me, but I intend to confine myself almost entirely to the first of the three divisions of the subject before us, leaving out what are usually understood as Sunday schools. If I should travel over ground which has already been traversed this morning, I consider that part of the blame ought to attach to the conductors of the Congress, because I had my instructions as to what part of the subject I was to take, and I presume that others had theirs in the same way. I take Sunday teaching in the broadest sense, namely, as that religious teaching for which the weekly Holy Day gives most time; but I say that such teaching is of little good unless it be given on other days of the week also. With regard to the defects in the present system of Sunday teaching, I am afraid that in the upper classes they are great, patent, and strangely overlooked. Information comes from schoolmasters, from college tutors, from clergy preparing candidates for confirmation, and even from those preparing candidates for ordination, all of whom concur in the statement that the ignorance of upper class children in elementary religious knowledge, and still more in anything like theology, is grievous. For example, an upper class schoolmaster has said that he often finds his boys not knowing what the word "Incarnation" means. I have here a letter which has only come into my hands this morning, and not addressed to me, but to another, containing some most striking, I think I may say most startling words. The writer has a preparatory school for the children of the upper classes, and prepares boys for Eton and Harrow. He asks, "Does no one take any thought for the children of the rich? They are really, I think, more neglected than the children of the poor; boys of nine, ten, and eleven come to me without the slightest knowledge of the Bible, being unacquainted even with the story of the Fall." He adds that they are as uninstructed in Bible history as children in the East End of London, and says, "I shall be inclined to propose at the next Diocesan Conference that missions be established at the West End of London, to teach parents of the upper classes their duty to their children." A bishop has deplored to me the ignorance of candidates for ordination of the Church Catechism, and speaking of the House of Commons, I may say, that on any question of religion being raised there, the lamentable ignorance of the subject renders such discussions most difficult to be carried on. Now as to the causes of this state of things. Although the large majority of English parents wish their children to have religious education, they do not take

any pains to ensure it. They rather assume that it will come if children are taken to church, and sent to schools with which they are on the whole satisfied. The services of the Church of England are admirably suited for instruction as well as worship, but to those only whose minds are prepared to receive that instruction. To unprepared minds they are unintelligible, or nearly so. Few take the trouble to explain the Church services to their children, to explain the order and the selection of passages of Scripture. I cannot help at this point saying a word of caution to the clergy on the subject of children's services ; I think there is great danger lest children's services should be degraded into something like religious twaddle. Children do not like to have people "talking down" to them. You must, of course, address a child in language he understands, but I doubt whether it is desirable to separate children and grown up persons for the purpose of letting the former go to church only to attend children's services. To my mind, it is a great mistake to put up a barrier between children's services on the one hand, and those of grown up people on the other. The Prayer Book says that instruction shall be given to children by the curate after the second lesson at the evening service, and that is not the same as what is usually called a children's service. On this matter, I would simply ask that the question should be thought over, and, if I am wrong, let the children's services remain as they are. I do not think that the children of the upper classes should go to church regularly until they can understand what they are going for. I am afraid very few people teach the Bible intelligently. It may be taught with intelligence without any loss of reverence, in the way Mr. Goe has pointed out, and there can be any amount of illustration without the slightest loss of reverence for the sacred character of the Book. It is to be feared, also, that the teaching of the good old Church Catechism, with explanation, is much out of fashion. Yet, where else is such a compendium of sound doctrine to be found, not only in England, but in the world, as the Church Catechism? As to schools, many give good secular teaching, and even seek for higher moral tone, but sadly neglect definite religious teaching ; yet this may be made as attractive as any other. Great opportunities, I think, are wasted here. One of the very best of public schools, to which I have sent two of my own sons, boasts of the system of no Sunday lessons. It may be right to give to masters and boys an absolute holiday from all teaching on the Sunday, but if that be so there should be careful Bible teaching in chapel, by either catechetical or expository lectures, and religious teaching on other days should, at the same time, be much more systematic. There is no reason whatever why the history of the Old and New Testaments should not be as thoroughly taught as the history of Rome, or Greece, or England. Yet there is little reason to doubt that if one took the sixth form at any of our public schools, the history paper which would be least well done would be that on Scripture history, except, perhaps, that on Church history. The best proof of this is that curious crop of absurd answers in Divinity examinations at Oxford—themselves very elementary—which has amused many generations of undergraduates, and which is being constantly replenished. I have spoken of the defects and of their causes, and now I come to the question of what can be done to remove the evils. I am not going to suggest anything Utopian. I would appeal, first to the clergy, secondly to the school teachers, and thirdly, and chiefly, to the parents. The clergy should look upon the children of the upper classes as exactly as much "lambs" to be "fed" as the children in the national schools. Few would ignore this in theory, but how many act upon it in practice? I may mention here as an example of what may be done, the very successful classes held in one large, well-worked town parish for upper class children. The clergyman who carries on this class has given me this information :—"Twenty years ago, soon after beginning my work, I was impressed

with the fact that the children of the middle and upper classes received less systematic religious instruction than those of the poor, and that my candidates for confirmation, whether boys or girls, from among the rich were, as a rule, miserably ignorant of Christian doctrine. Accordingly, I began a class on Saturday mornings, from eleven till one, and have found it most popular and very successful. Children come as soon as they can read. The average attendance is about 40 or 45, there being 70 or 80 on the books. I have found this catechetical class very useful, and one of the pleasantest parts of my work. I now reckon several hundreds of ex-pupils in the world, and in many cases have the children of my earlier catechumens." This example might be exactly followed in some cases, and in very many it might be at any rate imitated in spirit. To the school teachers of the classes I am speaking of, I must say they have a very special responsibility, for whilst the bulk of the children of the wage-earning class are taught in day schools, the classes above them, as a rule, send their children to boarding schools, and this the more especially in regard to boys, the higher we go up in the scale. Therefore, except during the holidays, the whole instruction rests with the school teachers. These able men have but to realise their responsibility in this vital matter, and very many will do what a few now do with great conscientiousness and success. Lastly, I appeal to the parents. They have, after all, the ultimate responsibility for their children, and, strange to say, even in this high region, the laws of supply and demand are in some measure obeyed. Not that all clergy, all schoolmasters, wait for a hint from parents to supply this instruction; but there are a great many who, if the parents ask for this instruction, will give it, and not otherwise. And whilst it is to parents that we must look for the main teaching of their children, clergy and schoolmasters ought to be on the look out to supplement what is done, or supply what is left undone at home. I do not think there is any reason to be afraid of Sundays being considered dull, if good religious teaching be given. On the contrary, good religious teaching will tend to make Sunday the "bright day" which George Herbert described it, and this will be more the case the less it is desecrated. I do not believe that the desecration of the Sunday is necessary to make it enjoyable. On the contrary, the better it is spent the more enjoyable it will be, and the more will the Sundays of childhood be looked back to in after life. If the foundations are deeply but simply laid in the years spent at home, then whatever instruction is given afterwards will fit into its place, sermons will be better understood, the Bible heard in the Church will be listened to with intelligence, and school lessons, even if deficient, will confirm good impressions already made. There is another thing I may say, both to teachers and parents, and it is that more use might be made than is commonly done of the Church lessons. If we were to take any pains to impress on children the real meaning of the lessons of Christmas, Easter, Ascension, and Whitsuntide, we should find them much better able to grasp and understand the mysteries of the Christian faith. Then, school sermons, in my judgment, should not merely be practical. We have a great number of very good practical sermons, and excellent things they are in their way, but I think there should be a regular course, every school term, of expository sermons. I plead for no controversial teaching, I ask for no overloading of young minds with such dry lessons as will make of Sunday a weariness. But I do ask parents, and all who have the charge of the young, to let no week pass without doing something to strengthen the foundations of that reasonable faith which grows in proportion as it is instructive and intelligent.

T. C. Thompson, Esq., M.P.

I FEEL myself in rather a strange place here. I never expected, as one of the lowliest and humblest members of the Church of England, that I should ever find myself before an assembly like this, composed almost entirely of holy women, and God-like men. I confess I should have had no excuse for presenting myself before you to-day, had it not been that some kind friends of mine in this assembly, knowing that for something like a quarter of a century I have been actively engaged in teaching in Sunday Schools in various parts of the country—in London, in the mining districts, sometimes even in Paris—and feeling that I might have something practical to say to you, asked me to come here and speak. Before I came here this morning, I took down a volume of Milton's poems, and my eyes rested on a passage which in some respects represents my feelings, speaking of you know who, and saying that

> "Abashed he stood,
> And felt how awful goodness is, and saw
> Virtue in her shape, how lovely."

When he is spoken of as regretting the position in which he stood, something of the same kind of feeling may be attributed to the individual who is now addressing you. I feel how awful goodness is, and pine for loveliness of virtue. But these things are only to be attained by those who have passed their lives in such holy and good work as I am sure is the characteristic of those I see before me. There is a good deal that affects us in this world in the shape of fashion. We see it emphasised in this assemblage. When I look around me I see fashion as well in the strange dresses of the holy men as in the dresses of ladies. A few years ago with them it was all amplitude and grandeur; where it is now all as tight as it can possibly be. Something like it has happened in our Sunday Schools. A few years ago, we were keeping with all honour the centenary of the foundation of Sunday schools, for they were the fashion once, but the age of Sunday schools is passing away. Not that they have not done an infinite amount of good in their time, for in the old days the Sunday school teaching was about the only religious teaching that could be got in the world. It was not very great to begin with, but it was the best to be had. Our knowledge has been increased by the industry and ability of such great teachers in the Church as Stanley, and Tristram, and Dr. Farrar, and by that wonderful book, the Life of Christ, by Dr. Geikie. These have opened our minds to views as startling as they are beautiful. This learning, now familiar to the teachers in our elementary schools, has rendered Sunday school teaching in some respect unnecessary, because the children are not now taught by the holy men on Sundays alone, but every day by the masters and mistresses of our day schools. I look upon the religious teaching in those schools as one of the greatest gains of the age. In nothing have we made more progress. A few days ago I listened to a religious inspector examining the children of my school in Sussex—and you know that Sussex is designated as the stupidest county in England—and that inspector never once during an examination, lasting for three or four hours, failed in eliciting from the children the answers he expected and wanted to his questions. That is a proof that we are doing good and efficient work in our religious teaching, and if Sunday schools are falling off in their influence among the middle classes—for I am now speaking of the middle classes alone—it is not because they have failed to do the work they were intended to do, but because their work is supplanted by more efficient work. But our religious education is still far from perfect. I will give you an illustration of what I mean. Immediately after the examination I have just spoken of, I had, on the Sunday, to

take my usual class. While thinking over a subject of instruction, I suggested that they should say the Lord's Prayer to me. When they came to the passage, "Thy Kingdom come," I stopped them, and asked them what those words meant. The answer I got from the whole school was, that it was something they would come to after they were dead. I said to them, "Do you then pray every day that you should die? Do you wish to die?" and the children were struck with the observation, and I think my present hearers may be struck with it, because it opens out a course of teaching in which, in my opinion, we are singularly deficient. We are always talking about what may be called the next world, as if this were not God's Kingdom. I do not know if any of you were present last night at a scene, I must say, the most glorious and magnificent I ever saw in my life, where a Canon of the Church, addressing two or three thousand of the working classes, drew their attention to such an extent that he might be said to hold their hearts in the hollow of his hand. If our teaching were always of that character; if we taught that the world we live in is God's Kingdom, that Jesus Christ built it up of plain simple men like the men of the working classes, that He laid down plain and simple rules for its government, that we may be all soldiers and servants in it, that this kingdom, very small at first, has grown up until it is the most powerful in all the world, that Jesus Christ is the only King and Lord in it, perhaps we might make it more clear to the great body of our people what an important element in their being religion is. Let me speak for a moment on the education of the higher classes. My friend, Mr. Talbot, if he will allow me to call him my friend—and, when you sit directly opposite to a gentleman every day, and entertain opinions directly opposite to his on most subjects, one comes to look upon him as a friend—has said that accounts from the different schools in the country show that the education of the pupils in those schools is extremely bad. Whose fault is it, I would ask, if it be so? If the education at our great schools is bad, it is your fault that it is bad, because the education of the people of England is the property of the people of England, and they should see that their property is properly administered. No school whatever, either high or low, for males or females, should be permitted to exist in this country without perfect independent inspection and report. That is what we want, and it is because we have not got it that the education in these schools is bad. If we had it, there would be a very different state of things. Over and over again, young men are sent down at the ages of fifteen or sixteen, from the public schools, because they have not reached a certain class. We ought to be ashamed that we employ teachers who are for ever failing in their work. If they teach properly, the boys will not fail. If the boys were to fail to attain the standard, I would remove the teachers, and leave the boys. Depend upon it, there never was a boy who could not be taught something, and if the teacher gives him up, it is because the teacher cannot find what to teach. We were engaged yesterday in a discussion on an unpleasant subject. Why does the evil to which that discussion related exist? Do you not add to it, when at the most dangerous age you send away young men from your public schools, to be taught by private tutors, by any one who will take them in for a certain amount for a few years, where there is no longer any discipline, and where the teaching is of the feeblest description? And this just at an age when the high tone of a large assemblage of boys is pre-eminently useful. I am surprised when I am told that at some of the large schools there is no proper religious education. Why not? If it be true, it must be because you, to whom the power belongs, neglect that proper supervision, without which all human things fall into decay. If you do not take care you will degrade the intellect of the boys, and their moral character too. There is something to be said also about the young ladies' schools. Do any of you take care that the young ladies' schools are properly inspected? There

are schools where the religious education is first rate. I do not belong to any party in the Church, and I do not sympathise with either High or Low Church. I belong to a far different Church. I belong to a Church which recognises neither High or Low, but recognises one Master, one Faith, one Teacher. But I may say that there is a school near me, carried on by the Sisters of East Grinstead, where the religious education is as good as in any other place of education in the world. And why, because that education is carefully carried on, and still more carefully supervised by ladies who make it their exclusive work. I am not touting for the Sisters of East Grinstead, but I say that if they can carry on education well, it can be carried on well elsewhere by others. There is, besides the upper and middle classes, a lower class, for whom I am here to appeal. Near me, and round me, there is a magnificent forest which is tenanted by human creatures in great numbers. They are people whom your magnificent, wealthy, proud, noble, useful Church does not try to reach. I speak of the wandering gipsies, people uneducated, untaught, untended. Can they not be taught, tended, educated? I have drawn them into my school. I have had some of these children come to me—filthy in their garments, so that the other children avoided them, with their hair uncombed—so ignorant that they had never heard of God, so strange among their fellow creatures that when they came first they were frightened to sit near the other children. But my governess adopts a system which I would recommend to all governesses in country schools. It is to touch the heart as well as the head. She took these children in hand, and the first hopefu sign we saw was when a little girl came with her hair brushed, and a blue ribbon at the back of her head, and her hair tied up. I may say, as an old teetotaller, I am very fond of that blue ribbon for other purposes, but here it had a significance of its own. It was a sign that we had touched her heart. The tone and the manners of the other children had told upon her. And then, and thus, we touched her intellect, and by-and-by she and her brother were in some measure educated, and we found them kind and gentle. These children, who are now growing up, never see me in a fair but they run up and shake me by the hand. I say, then, that you can touch these people, and it is your duty to touch them.

DISCUSSION.

The Rev. J. T. Jeffcock, Rector of Wolverhampton.

I wish to say a few practical words about Middle Class Sunday schools, and I shall take the case of the school which has been under my superintendence for two years last past in Wolverhampton. We have, of course, in Wolverhampton, no county families, and our merchant princes have gone to live out of the town; so that although we have in it the children of the upper classes resident in the town, ours may still be considered a middle-class school. It consists of the children of professional men and tradesmen, and is for girls only, as we have not yet established one for boys. The first difficulty I had to contend with was to separate the middle class from the lower class. This I have done by hiring a room, and requiring each scholar to pay 5s. a year, to meet the expenses of rent, this having the effect of separating the two classes. I have not had more than 30 girls in the school at one time. I open the school myself, and at about half an hour before the school for the lower classes opens. The curates of the parish each have their own department of the lower schools. Each Sunday, in the middle-class school, I have taken a certain portion of the Church Catechism in order, explaining and dwelling upon each paragraph, so that the instruction should be systematic. At a quarter-past ten the school breaks up into three classes, to whom Bible lessons are given by three educated volunteer teachers. The result

has been something of this kind. The instruction given has certainly been systematic, because it has been carried out on the lines of the Church Catechism. The attendance has also been regular. The scholar who pays, you may depend upon it, will come regularly, because he or she is sent to school, not in an unconscious way, for the parent is quite conscious, when the child comes once a quarter for school money, of what he is doing, and takes care that the attendance shall be regular. The school has been conducted more or less on the family system. We have only held it in the morning, so that the children are not wearied, but in the afternoon they are invited to come to a Children's Service. As one of the results of the system adopted, I have found that at the Confirmation the candidates were much better prepared than they would otherwise have been. I had, in fact, been preparing them for sixteen months, instead of giving them six or eight weeks' preparation, as I should otherwise have done. We find that the children who came to the morning class have in some instances volunteered as teachers for the lower schools in the afternoon. I believe that still another result has been obtained. The Church of England has great sympathy for the higher classes, because it looks to them for support and assistance, and it has also very great sympathy with the lower classes, because they require its assistance, but with the middle classes, perhaps, it has not so much sympathy. I remember, just about the time I was ordained, hearing a clergyman say, "Which of us gets into the little back parlour, behind the shop?" Well, I think that some of us do so now. I am persuaded that a school of the kind I have referred to produces a great deal of sympathy between the clergy and the middle classes, because it works on the parents, attracts them to church, and makes them feel themselves integral portions of the Church, and feel that the Church has their interests at heart.

The Rev. Canon F. J. Holland.

I speak at a double disadvantage; in the first place, because I have been introduced to you as "Canon Scott Holland," whose address yesterday so powerfully moved our hearts; and in the next place, because I have been asked to speak quite unexpectedly to myself. Now, though I regard it as an act of great presumption in any man to address a Church Congress without due preparation, yet in this instance I excuse myself, by consideration of the deep and special interest which I have taken in one of the subjects now before us. It has been said by one speaker that there is no sufficient provision made for the religious education of the upper classes, and that this defect is made known to us when we are preparing candidates for Confirmation. With that statement I fully agree, speaking from a large experience; and I might add that, judging from the papers sent in to us, we should conclude that there is insufficient instruction, not only in theology, but in much besides—for example, in spelling and composition. We need definite and careful teaching, and especially in religion. For I believe that the religious instruction given to the children of the upper class, where it is given at all, is in their homes quite indefinite, and in their schools scholastic, rather than religious. Distinct Church teaching is almost ignored in home and school alike. That there is an improvement I thankfully admit; for if we described the state of things when I was a boy, it certainly would have been true to say that in most cases there was no religious teaching whatsoever. I stand here as a specimen of one who never at home, except in the form of learning a Psalm now and then, and reading a chapter, and never at school, in any form, received one half hour's religious instruction worthy of the name. There is a change for the better now at Eton, and religious instruction is given. On Saturday, the boys have papers given to them of questions which they answer on Sunday. The questions are, doubtless, excellent as a matter of Biblical instruction, but they are lesson-like, and quite insufficient, except they be supplemented by grave, and definite, and spiritual instruction, given in the college chapel. Who does not know that there may be religious instruction with very little religion in it? With regard to girls of the upper class, the case is different, or, at any rate may be made so, if Churchmen will forward Church day schools for girls. I speak as an interested person. I have used my best endeavours to promote the religious instruction of girls in such schools. And if all of those present in this hall will take, each one, £100 worth of shares in those great schemes which have been set on foot for the establishment of Church of England High Schools for Girls, they will forward a godly work, they will receive a decen

dividend, and they will do much more for the religious instruction of England than by discussing plans and listening to speeches. The religious teaching in these day schools is sound, and definite, and spiritual. It is joined to high secular education, and is not disjoined from home life. All this is most salutary for the girl's life. No scheme of education could possibly be better. The text proposed for our discourses this morning is *Sunday* Teaching for the Upper Classes; and I am afraid that I shall be accounted one of those "fugitive Divines," disliked by Fuller, who, he says, "take a text to run away from it." For I am not about to advocate Sunday teaching, but to show you how valuable and feasible is religious teaching, for children of rich and poor together, which is not given on Sunday. The saying, "The better the day, the better the deed," is not applicable here, for the week-day is best. But how are we to get the children together? I will tell you a secret, which it took me seventeen years to find out, and it is that there is nothing in the Educational Code to prevent you from taking all the children in your schools to the church, to receive there religious instruction, on Saints'-days, or, indeed, on any days, during the 45 minutes allowed for such instruction. In my own parish, in London, I used always, of late years, to take our school children to the Church on Saints'-days, and our short service, at 9 a.m., was as impressive as it was instructive. But this gave the opportunity which I desired, of providing religious instruction for the children of the upper class as well, for we brought all the girls belonging to one of our High Schools to the same service, and also invited those who went to no school. I strongly recommend this plan for adoption by those pastors the circumstances of whose parishes may make it possible. But opportunities without the *faculty* of giving religious instruction to the upper class will be of little avail. There are special qualifications needed by us. One great drawback to success is found in our own natural shyness, and the best remedy for this is knowledge—a thorough mastery of our subject. I am not naturally shy, but I had of late a parishioner who made me uncomfortable, and sometimes very shy. She is an elderly lady, nearly 80 years of age, and yet I think it improbable that there is any person in this large assembly who could compete with her in exact and wonderful knowledge and remembrance of Holy Scripture. I felt always shy in her presence, until I made a compact with her, that whenever she asks me to read a passage of Scripture, she should tell me at once the chapter and verse. My shyness was due to my ignorance, and the fear of being called upon to do that which I was not prepared to do. And the shyness of many of our clergy in giving instruction to the upper class is due to their ignorance, or to their lack of preparation. The one great qualification, then, we need, is knowledge, absolute knowledge, of our own particular subject. I need hardly say that one thing more is needful, viz., that our hearts should be drawn out towards those whom we teach. Otherwise we are sure to give that barren instruction of which I have spoken—religious instruction without religion in it. I know an instance where a notable and profound scholar—one of our leading authorities in Holy Scripture—offered to teach in an upper class school; but after the first lecture which he gave to the girls, the great object of the head mistress was to shorten the course, and never to repeat it. By not entering into the minds and needs of his pupils, the teacher was actually doing harm to them, good man and good scholar though he was. To teach the children of the upper class is a great responsibility, which must not be evaded, but which must be undertaken with much care, much study, and much prayer for God's grace; and carried out, I would add, in the continual remembrance of our own childhood and its curious needs, and dispositions, and satisfactions.

J. H. MILLARD, Esq., Superintendent of the Sunday School of St. Mary's Episcopal Chapel, Reading.

TWENTY-FIVE years since a youth was carelessly walking through the Market Place of this town, and a Christian Sunday school teacher put his hand on the youth's shoulder and invited him to the neighbouring Sunday school of St. Lawrence. The youth, impressed with the interest shown in him, accepted the invitation, joined the Sunday school, and having passed from boy to teacher, that one is now superintendent, with the help of two ladies as superintendents in the girls' and infants', of one of the largest Sunday schools in the diocese of Oxford, numbering nearly one thousand scholars, and upwards of one hundred voluntary teachers. He it is who now stands

before you as a personal testimony to the value of Sunday teaching. One hundred years more have passed away since Robert Raikes laid the foundation of the vast fabric of Sunday school work now flourishing in every part of the world ; but 1,800 years before that in the dining room of the humble dwelling near the Sea of Tiberias went forth the command to Peter, "Feed my lambs." Rolling over the long vista of years the command still comes, and who will obey it? At this Congress, among the many important questions which have been discussed, few have equalled in importance that which now claims our attention. We may grieve over the spread of scepticism, rationalism, and other errors, but depend upon it if we can by God's help bring religious influence to bear on the young, we shall be doing much to stem the torrent of evil, and we may find hidden among what is outwardly unfavourable, many bright diamonds, hereafter to be centres of light and influence. The question of Sunday teaching has been presented to us this morning, under the threefold aspect of teaching among the upper, lower, and middle classes ; in the first I have had no experience, and only remark that these, from the very position in which they are placed, ought not to be in so much need of religious teaching as the children of the lower classes. Starting from what I am sure we shall all agree to, that it is the duty of every one to try and, by God's help, leave the world a little better than we find it ; it is the children of the lower classes to whom we should specially direct our attention. We remember that it is from these that many honoured names have come, as a result of Sunday teaching. Need I mention a Livingstone, the factory lad ; a Williams, the ironmonger's boy ; a Stephenson, or an Abel Heywood ; as illustrations of this.

"The humblest being born is great,
If true to his degree ;
His virtue illustrates his fate,
Whatever it may be.
Then let us daily learn to love
Simplicity and worth,
For not the eagle, but the dove
Brought peace unto the earth."

Assuming that everyone in this hall is of one mind as to the importance of Sunday school work, I shall conclude that each is willing to lend his or her part in carrying it on. The clergy can scarcely be expected among their other pressing claims to take the entire management and control of a Sunday school. It is essentially a layman's and a laywoman's work, and every one in a parish ought to be willing in some way or other to help it forward. Some may not be able to teach, all have not the gift ; but these can in many other ways encourage those who are able and willing to do so. In a Sunday school, all differences of rank should sink the moment the teachers enter the school rooms. The work is too important to be tainted with the feeling of *caste*, so prevalent in these days, and which I cannot but fear is such a hindrance to religious work. In my own Sunday school I look with pleasure to the fact that the prosperous man of business and the factory operative, the banker's clerk and the foundry moulder, the independent gentleman and the journeyman plasterer, can forget social positions for the while, and greet each other with a hearty grip of the hand, having fellowship the one with the other. In the teaching itself the lessons should be plain, simple, and to the point ; partaking more of a conversational character than preaching, which, to children especially, is a weariness to the flesh. The superintendent, subject to the approval of the clergy, should either arrange the lessons for the year, or the admirable series of the C.E.S.S. Institute, or S.S. Union might be adapted. The clergy should, if possible, arrange for preparation classes for the younger teachers, to which occasionally the members of the senior Bible classes might be invited. The provision of suitable class rooms for the elder scholars is absolutely essential in every Sunday school. Who can tell the thousands of young men and women who once attended our Sunday schools, but who are now leading lives of vice and shame, might not have been retained under Christian influence and instruction had proper accommodation been provided for them ; they have now, however, drifted away from us, and, entrapped by those ever on the alert to lead the young and unwary astray, have to answer for the fearful sins of a wasted life. I cannot too strongly urge this point upon my hearers, and I hope it may be the means of every clergyman seeing that class rooms are provided for the senior classes of their schools before the young people drift away altogether. But I am warned my time has nearly expired ; two other points and I have done. One very important matter is the attendance of the children

at church. I would say, Don't insist on the younger children going to a long church service, if you do, they will dislike it, and a dislike acquired in youth frequently means hatred in after years. For the junior classes we arrange for a shortened Church of England Service in our largest room, where from 500 to 600 take part, conducted by the superintendent and qualified teachers. As the children get older they are drafted into the church, and, having already been prepared for it, will enter into the service with pleasure and spirit, unless, as I fear is frequently the case, the children are placed in the worst position in the church. The other point I would refer to is the most important, as it is the hidden secret of all success—*prayer*. I would say as a teacher, having a large men's Bible class, as well as being superintendent, never prepare your lessons without prayer, never leave your home without prayer, and encourage prayer openly among your scholars. In our schools we commence with a prayer meeting every Sunday morning at nine, and close with one after school in the afternoon. Finally, let us cultivate a true missionary spirit among the scholars; let the heathens at home, as well as those abroad, be frequently remembered; let our scholars know by frequent visits to their homes we really desire to be their friends, and then, with God's blessing, we shall see and know our labours are not in vain. Let us remember, one soul brought in through our instrumentality will be a star in our crown by-and-bye. Let this stir us up to more fervour and zeal in the great work before us, remembering the judge of all assigns rewards proportionate to the works of faith on earth. He gives degrees of glory according to the spiritual activity and usefulness of the redeemed; He assigns to the high places His most faithful servants; He gives the highest honours to those who have brought in most fruit. Let us then in this work,

> "Work on—one day beyond
> All thoughts of praise—
> A sunny joy shall crown our
> Head with rays—nor other than
> Our need—our recompense."

The Rev. Dr. BELCHER, Vicar of St. Faith's, Stoke Newington.

I THINK we should not stray away from the ideas set before us in the two valuable papers read here this morning, the one chiefly about Sunday schools, and the other more especially referring to catechising. I wish to say, what I think is the general opinion here, that the value of the first paper read to us cannot be too highly estimated. Not only was the advice and counsel given therein most just and sound, and judicious, but it also showed a very hopeful sign of levelling up in the right direction. These two papers ought to be regarded, the one as supplementary to the other. Many churchmen—some, perhaps, of what are called High Church principles—require to at once dismiss from their minds the notion that the Sunday school is an anti-church, or a sort of dissenting institution. Some time ago a great deal of noise was made about the centenary of Sunday schools. As a matter of fact, however, the Sunday school is a very old Romish institution. I myself often go to Rome—although I always take a return ticket. Whenever I do go I make it my business to go every Sunday afternoon to the Great Basilica of St. Peter's, to look at the large Sunday school in the side aisles. It is, perhaps, one of the most interesting sights one could witness; and if there is anyone here who is going to Rome this season, I would advise him to go and see it. A good many High Churchmen want to dismiss from their minds the notion that they ought to have nothing to do with Sunday schools. In London, and more especially in that part of it under our right rev. Chairman's immediate direction, the Sunday school cannot possibly be dispensed with, because it is one of the most valuable aids to public catechising. In my church, I have always had a Sunday school and public catechising, and my experience is, that with our poorer and less informed brethren, it supplies the want of that parental instruction which has been referred to to-day. This is the proper position in which Church Sunday schools should be placed. I am of opinion that the superintendent of a Sunday school, where he is not a clergyman, ought to have some authority to teach. He ought to be able to answer the questions, "How shall they hear without a preacher, how shall they preach unless they be sent?" and, "Who sent you?" The clergyman should endeavour to get his superintendent appointed a licensed reader, or authorised by the only person entitled to give

authority to teach religion in his diocese—the bishop. One speaker has spoken of breaking the rubric by not catechising after the second lesson. I, myself, felt that was a difficulty, but I went to the Lord Bishop of Bedford—our chairman of to-day—and asked him to authorise or approve a very much shortened form of Evensong. We use that form, and have catechising after the second lesson, according to the rubric, with a service suited for children. This we have found to be perfectly satisfactory, and I have also the satisfaction of feeling that no man can haul me up before Lord Penzance for not catechising after the second lesson. A clergyman, for whom I have much respect—the aged Vicar of Frome, Mr. Bennett—handed to me, some years ago, a printed paper which he circulates through his parish, and which states that no person shall be confirmed in the parish of Frome, unless they, without respect to rank or station in life, come to be catechised in the Church according to the rubric, and thus prepared by him, so that all persons whether they are of those who insolently call themselves the upper classes, or of those whom we so impudently called the lower classes, or of those who are called the middle classes, or of those to whom is applied that most exasperating expression of all, the lower middle classes—have to go to him or his nominee to be prepared for confirmation. This is a system which it would, perhaps, be well for others to adopt. I am of opinion that there should be catechising in the Church every Sunday, and that there ought to be a children's service every Sunday at least. A great many of our brethren, to whom these children's services seem to be irksome, have them only once in the month. That is just like having the sacrament once in the month. In my own church, a Sunday has never passed, since I went there in 1871, without a children's service, and I believe—although I say it with all humility—that our system has been quietly adopted all round. Some people say that Matins and Evensong are not suitable for children—they certainly appeal to the intellectual faculties in a very prominent way. There is, however, one service to which no one has referred this morning. I will tell you what we do, and I am not going to defend it, or to ask for criticism upon it. Those parents who go to Church bring their children with them to the one service ordained by Christ Himself—the Holy Commnnion. They are brought up to see things as we hold they should be, and they do not regard the Lord's Supper as a thing they had never heard of until they came to be instructed for first Communion. They know all about it from their early childhood, for they see it every Lord's-Day. It is the great religious want of our day in England that we should go back to primitive Christianity, for our Saviour Christ never said, "Suffer little children to come to Matins," but He did say, "Suffer little children to come to ME."

The Rev. CANON ELLISON, Great Haseley, Oxon.

I SENT in my name to the Chairman, because I wished to do what the previous speaker has done for me—to bring back the recollection of the meeting to those two admirable papers we heard at the commencement of the meeting, and because there was just one point on which it appeared to me a wrong impression might be left on the minds of those present. Mr. Goe emphasised it in a few words, when he said he doubted the wisdom of having Sunday schools for the children of the upper and middle classes. I entirely agree with Mr. Goe in all he said with regard to the duty of parents. Of course, it is the one great duty of parents to instruct their children in religion, and nothing can compensate for the want of that. But we must remember, especially in regard to large towns, how many parents there are who are utterly incapable of teaching their children. How many belonging—and I must use that offensive term, for want of a better—to the lower middle class, who would be entirely beyond their depth if they were to try and teach their children, and who have in consequence allowed their children to drift, little by little, into the Nonconformist Sunday schools. I entirely agree with Mr. Randall, that we cannot dispense with the regular catechising of the children in church, and that, whether it be in Sunday school or in Church, we are bound to use that admirable form of instruction, the Church Catechism. I remember, in the writings of Jean Paul, meeting with a sentence of this kind, "The watchword of the English life is 'duty,'" and he added that he recognises this as coming from the Church Catechism which they use, and in which everyone is told to do his duty in that state of life into which it has pleased God to call him. I think Mr. Goe rather answered his own objection when he said it was quite right to bring children

together on Sundays in drawing-rooms. The middle class Sunday school I had for nearly twenty years in the town of Windsor, in which I was vicar, arose in this way. A lady did bring a few of these neglected children into her drawing-room. I saw the advantage of it, and I applied for, and obtained the use of, the council chamber. In a very short time the school had outgrown the accommodation to be found there, and overflowed into the Town Hall, and then again into another building, which we were obliged to get for the boys. I think that the very fact of middle and lower class children being so glad to take advantage of a school of this kind, shows the great need which has to be met. Something has been said about its not being our duty merely to prepare children for confirmation, and I entirely agree with that, but at the same time I think it is our duty mainly to do so. I think that every child, from the very moment he begins to be taught, ought to have put before him that great reason which is to be the reason of his own conscious choice whether or no he will serve his Saviour. It has been said that confirmation ought to be a reality, and that it is real repentance and faith which are the conditions of the Christian Covenant. If you keep that before the children, it is quite right that you should teach them the nature of repentance, and that by speaking to the heart, you should do all you can to make their confirmation a real choice when the season comes. In the Sunday school we had, I can only say I do not doubt, for a single moment, that such was the effect of the teaching given to the children. I found that those who, when they came up to be prepared for confirmation before the school was started, were the most ignorant of the whole population, and who could not for a moment hold their own by the side of the children taught in the National schools, after the establishment of the school came well prepared, almost better prepared than any others. I found that in the elder class of that Sunday school, we had, practically, a confirmation class of the highest order going on through the whole year. In this way we were able to individualise the children in a way that otherwise we never could have done. We found out what their characters were, and what their lives were like, and I can look now with pleasure upon the lives of many of those young persons. I see them—some as governesses, some as the wives of clergymen, adorning their station whatever it may be, and I believe they one and all look back to their Sunday school days, and recognise that nearly all the good they received in early life was gained in the school. I hope, therefore, that whatever else may be said as to the necessity of catechising in Church, which I entirely agree with, and which I think can be made entirely consistent with such Sunday school work, none here will be deterred, where the same conditions prevail, from setting up that which I believe they will find to be of the most essential service, namely, a Sunday school for the middle, lower middle, and upper classes.

The Rev. C. Barnwell, Vicar of South Broom, Wilts.

I listened, like everyone else, to the two papers with feelings of the greatest respect, and yet I felt that the two eloquent speakers had come down this morning, by early train, from Utopia to address us. We are not all heaven-born catechists and teachers. There is a certain book, called "The Cruise upon Wheels," which relates how far two gentlemen, possessed of water, fire, a piece of meat, and potatoes could be from producing boiled mutton. We have got our teachers, our children, and ourselves, but we are many of us very far from producing a catechetical lesson that would really enlighten the intellect, or touch the heart. I should like to suggest to some of my brethren the method I have myself adopted, and which I have found to quicken and raise the tone of two Sunday schools, one in a large London parish, and one in a country town in Wilts. Every parson, who is worth anything, is in the habit of teaching pretty frequently in his day school, and gets to know how much children can take in. I would say to such a one, let him, during the week, prepare, with the utmost pains and care, a set of useful, homely, practical notes for a lesson, and let him get those notes printed. You can buy for 4½d. enough paper to last for a month, and they can be easily printed by means of one of the numerous apparatus in use. Let him then distribute a copy to each of the Sunday school teachers, and to those of the parishioners who have children. By this means you can obtain a body of teaching which you can really work upon when you get to the catechising. In my London parish I was surprised to find how many of the well-to-do people really wished to have their children taught, although they would never have thought of sending them

to a Sunday school, and did not know how to teach them themselves. It is really no easy matter for an old-fashioned papa or mama to teach a boy fresh from a crack public school, but papa and mama, furnished with the notes, found they had in their hands a certain amount of information, and they could instruct them, and bring them to church to listen to the hymns, and hear what was going on. In the country town I found the same thing going on, and that the little leaven of the notes leavened a very considerable lump, both in the upper and middle classes.

The Rev. Dr. Griffith.

One mode of improving the Sunday teaching of all classes would be for sponsors really to undertake the duties which they hear from the lips of the clergyman at the font belong to them. We want heart-teaching, and when a sponsor has made himself agreeable to the family into which he has been admitted by the relationship in which he stands to his God-child, he can speak to the heart, if he has a heart to speak with. The special duty of the sponsor is to see that the child be taught. We have schools for Sunday teaching, but none for Sunday examining; nor do we want any regular Sunday examiners. If sponsors will undertake the duties they have engaged themselves to do, we shall have a system of education which will go a long way to fix the religious teaching of the Church throughout the land. Will any one here who is a sponsor, and who may have neglected his duties up to the present time, recollect that it is one of the chief wants of the Church that sponsors should look after their God-children's religious education. Could we not have this question more prominently brought before us, so that the clergyman's heart might not be so frequently almost broken at the font, by people engaging in these duties without appearing to have the least interest in the matter; and so as to prevent many a conscience being pricked by the recollection of how very imperfectly the duties of the sponsor have been discharged?

The Rev. Sir James E. Philipps, Bart., Vicar of Warminster.

I wish to say a word or two on the subject of children's services in church. I believe we are allowed, after having a celebration of the Holy Communion, Matins, and Evensong, to have any other religious service, so long as it is made up from passages from the Bible or the Prayer Book. Some of the clergy, in consequence, make up a children's service. Not long since, an address was presented to the Lower House of Convocation of Canterbury, asking them to prepare a children's service. I hope they will do nothing of the kind, because I think the great object the clergy should have in view is to teach children how to use the Book of Common Prayer. A friend of mine recently took a religious census of his parish, and found those who did not profess to belong to any particular sect, but said that, if anything, they belonged to the Church of England, on being asked why then they never presented themselves at church, some said, it was through poverty and want of proper clothes to go in; but the answer repeatedly given was that they did not know how to use the Prayer Book. I would ask my brethren, under these circumstances, to kindly consider if it is not better in our children's services to follow the lines of the Prayer Book. Do not let us give the children a patchwork service. They do not thank you for it, and nothing is more uninteresting. Give them short Matins, or short Evensong, and then they will learn how to use the Prayer Book. A non-conformist, speaking on the question of Sunday schools, said to me, "Our schools are full and our chapels are empty." I do not say that applies universally. I daresay that in many cases the chapels are full as well as the schools, but I hope we may say that our schools are full and our churches also. There may, however, be occasionally some whom we miss after they have left the Sunday school; I do not think we should miss them if we taught them to use the Prayer Book. I may be allowed to say—and I know there are men who are earnestly attached to the Church of England, and are good Catholics as well as Anglicans, who feel strongly with me on this point—that I am not yet convinced of the wisdom of taking the whole

school to the Holy Communion. I think that before children are brought to their first communion, they should be allowed to be present at the Holy Mysteries ; but I would not bring a whole school, containing children of all ages, to a celebration of the Holy Communion. I do not think it tends to reverence. I do not think so, and there are thousands who feel with me. It does not tend to deepen reverence in the minds of very young children, and I should be very sorry if it went forth to the Church and the world that those at the Reading Congress were all of one mind in this respect, and that they all wished our school children to be taken *en masse* to celebrations of the Holy Communion.

The Rev. T. Stevens, Vicar of Saffron Walden.

I will confine myself, as far as possible, to this question in its bearing on the so-called middle class. I am more strongly of opinion every year that the teaching of the middle classes in religious knowledge can never be thoroughly effectual if confined to the Sunday, and that it must be given during the week in schools such as those referred to by Canon Holland, identified with one or other of the schools of thought in the Church of England. It must always be the case that a large number of the children of the middle classes receive their instruction away from home, at boarding schools, where it is impossible that they can have direct parental teaching, or the teaching of the clergyman who may afterwards prepare them for confirmation. Having had some experience in the examination of middle-class schools, as well as in their religious instruction, I should like to contradict to the utmost of my power what has been said of the deterioration of religious teaching in schools. My belief is that there is far better teaching in our days in religious, as well as in secular knowledge, than there used to be. I believe that far more earnestness and thought are thrown into it than was the case some years ago. I speak both of girls' and boys' schools, and not Church schools exclusively. For instance, for some 17 years past I have had to go to schools connected with the Society of Friends, and various Nonconformist bodies, as an examiner from the University of Cambridge, and I have been gratified to find that, whilst they were most willing to allow the pupils to be examined in religious knowledge by myself, in nearly every case there was evidence of far more than intellectual training, that there were signs of the appeal to the heart as well as to the head. One practical suggestion I would make, which has not yet been made very definitely. We clergy, as has been said, are very shy, and when I went to the parish where I now am a short time ago I felt greatly at a loss what to do in this matter. Few things have pleased me more than to find how welcome one was on offering to give religious instruction on a week-day in a middle-class school. If similar offers were made by the clergy much more often than they are, in cases of private adventure schools, I am sure they would be welcomed heartily, and the results would be most telling. Not only have I found such teaching directly useful in these schools, but when moral questions have been raised in them, the master or mistress has come to one for advice, or asked one to bring one's influence to bear on the children. I feel strongly we all of us have as much as we can do on the Sunday. With the services he has to conduct, and the sermons he has to preach, I do not see how a clergyman can do much more than inspire the laity, both men and women, as far as possible, with a desire to work for the Church. But we most of us have a week-day morning we could give to religious teaching in such schools, and I think this might be done much more than it is, for the benefit of the class above that which sends children to National schools. In conclusion, I must say one word about the gipsy children. I believe we are not doing nearly enough for the outcast children. They will never come to the same school with decently clad and well brought up children of the class above them, but I believe that if Christian women would take two or three of them into their own homes, they would be doing one of the most blessed Christian works that could be done throughout the length and breadth of the land. This class of children is terribly overlooked. It is difficult to deal with them, but they might be picked up in twos or threes by independent workers. We could all find such, although I doubt if they could ever be classed with other children.

The Rev. J. Grant Bird, Christ Church, Staleybridge.

Sunday teaching for the children of the lower class has been revolutionised by the rapid spread of education, which has been in great part effected by the beneficial influence of the Education Acts. Its chief business now is hardly so much to impart as, by the Holy Spirit's blessing, to guide and sanctify knowledge by the addition of the divine wisdom. To-day, then, our Sunday school system, the vehicle of by far the largest portion of the Sunday teaching for the children of the lower class, may realise a higher ideal than heretofore. In every parish it should be regarded as a machine, ready at hand, to prevent in future generations those evils which sad experience has found it impossible to cure in this. Might not teachers be authoritatively encouraged in a crusade against any prevalent form of local sin, and a simultaneous attack upon it be delivered in the steadily increasing number of dioceses and rural deaneries which have a good Sunday school organisation? Nor is a notable example wanting. At the call of the Church of England Temperance Society, inebriety has thus received its most deadly wound, and sobriety found its strongest bulwark. Similarly, I would ask whether the vital national questions of Purity and the Prevention of the Degradation of Women and Children, so ably and touchingly debated in this hall yesterday, might not be in some measure solved by Sunday teaching—especially where, as in the north of England, the scholars generally remain in attendance until they are adults—and thus give opportunity for continual reminders of the principles they imbibed as children? There are teachers who have sprung from the lower as well as the middle and upper classes, and, depend upon it, each class has its own special lesson to give to the world. Nothing can make a greater impression upon the elder children, than that one who has, in time past, wrestled with and overcome exactly their own temptations, should, after working the week long in perhaps the same mill or forge, devote a portion of the day of rest to their highest good. As the figure of our Saviour in the reredos of St. Mary's, Reading, is illumined by the light passing through the painted panes of the east window, so the Word of God, exhibited through the medium of their self-denial, glorifies the Christ and commands the imitation of His life. Is anyone more likely to create a healthy and holy opinion among the lads of a parish than their own Sunday teacher? or is there anyone who can speak more wisely and usefully to the girls than the instructress who, knowing their several temperaments, surroundings, and temptations, utilises God's Day to the planting of the white flower of a blameless life? In fine, the present Sunday teaching of the children of the lower class requires only organisation, direction, and encouragement to do grander work than it has yet accomplished, inasmuch as it has better material to work upon.

The Rev. J. F. Osborne, Vicar of St. Peter's, Upper Holloway.

I have no doubt we are all painfully conscious that the teaching in Sunday schools is not so effective as it might be. I would suggest that the Sunday school teachers should go in for the examinations held by the Sunday School Institute. They are most useful, and the committee have done their best to make them as easy as possible, in order to suit the capabilities of all teachers. If they were properly taken up, and the clergy would form instruction classes, in order to prepare the teachers for them, we should find that the teaching in schools would be far more effective than it is at present. I am sure the committee would be only too glad to extend these examinations all over the country. I think also that we should visit the private venture schools for the children of the middle and upper classes more than we do, for the purpose of giving religious instruction on week-days, where it is not practicable on Sundays. When a curate at Surbiton, with my former revered vicar, Canon Garbett, we both held classes of this kind which were much valued and appreciated. I look back with great pleasure to the week-day classes I held in schools for young ladies, and young gentlemen, and I think this work might be effectively done by the clergy in towns where there are good schools for the children of the upper and middle classes.

The Rev. CANON FISHER.

I HAD no intention whatever of addressing this assembly, but, after listening to the papers and speeches, it seems to me that one branch of the subject has been almost, if not altogether, overlooked. One speaker asked what was to be done with the young people when they wished to leave Sunday schools, and his answer to the question was that they should be converted into Sunday school teachers. Well, however excellent our Sunday school scholars may be, there must be a great number of them in large parishes who are not in any way qualified to act as Sunday school teachers. It seems to me that in large parishes we require a system of Bible-classes to supplement the Sunday school teaching. It has been my happiness to work for a certain length of time in a very large parish, where we have Bible-classes of considerable size, in fact, numbering between 150 to 200 scholars, for young men and women. As soon as they reach the age of 14 or 15, and desire to leave the Sunday school, they are drafted off into one or the other of these classes, and we have, sometimes, as many as 200 young men and women coming regularly every Sunday to receive definite doctrinal education. What is more remarkable still is, that we have found that they not only elect to come, but they can hardly bear to go away when they have suitable offers made to them of entering upon other work. We have young women in some of our Bible-classes who have reached the age of 25, and others who have reached the age of 23 or 24, and they still come regularly every Sunday morning and afternoon. I do not think I am really wandering from the subject before us, and the matter is of the greatest importance, for I believe it will be the experience of every parish priest, that, though it is comparatively easy to get the Sunday school children, it is exceedingly difficult to keep them when they reach that age when everyone likes to be independent. I do not think it possible, therefore, to consider the question of Sunday schools, without also taking into consideration the question of Bible-classes. The Sunday school is the nursery, but the Bible-class is the schoolroom, and it ought to be a great help to the parish priest in helping him in preparing his candidates for confirmation. So far as I could see from the papers and speeches which have gone before, no one has yet turned his attention to this branch of the subject. We should be considering exclusively the subject of Sunday teaching, but we have been gradually drifting into that of week-day teaching, which does not in any way compensate for the lack of observing the Lord's Day, and learning the doctrines of the Holy Catholic Church at the hands of those appointed to teach them.

There being no more cards upon the table, and the time allowed to this Session not being exhausted, the Chairman summed up the discussion.

CONGRESS HALL,

THURSDAY AFTERNOON, OCTOBER 4TH.

The Right Rev. the PRESIDENT in the Chair.

THE CHURCH AND PUBLIC SCHOOLS.

PAPERS.

The Rev. E. C. WICKHAM, M.A., Master of Wellington College.

I TAKE the subject on which I have been asked to read a paper, not in the sense which it may well bear, of the relation between the Public schools and the life moral and spiritual of the community—how far they feel and answer to its movements, how far they are its seed plots and genial nurseries—that is the sense in which it is of the profoundest interest to the Church and to the nation; but in that sense, perhaps, one who is himself engaged in the work is not the best fitted to measure it. I take it as the simpler question how far the educational machinery of the Public schools and the religious machinery of the Church of England are working, or can be made to work, together towards common ends. Even in this aspect of the subject I prefer to leave to others the question from the side of the schools—what they are doing or leaving undone to further or prepare for the work of the Church. I hope some who follow me will tell us that. My purpose is to point out something which the Church can do to help the Public schools.

I would sum this up in one sentence. She can maintain and encourage, through her rulers, and still more through the avowed sentiments of churchmen, the feeling, traditional, and till lately unquestioned in this country, that education is in a very special sense *Church* work, that the office of a master in a Public school, especially a boarding school, is essentially a *pastoral* office, an office fit for a clergyman, and which a clergyman can most suitably fill.

I ventured to press this in a paper which I read six years ago to a Church Congress, and though I should not have sought to do so a second time, as I have been asked to write on the subject I must press it again, for—(1) I think that the maintenance of a considerable clerical element in the teaching and government of the Public schools is of moment generally, and at this special time, both for the Church and for the schools; and (2) I think that the question rests to a very great extent with the Church itself, with parents who in the schools referred to are in very large proportion Church people, and with those who set the tone of thinking among young churchmen as to the character and duties of the clerical office.

People look down the list of the masters at one Public school or another, and notice sometimes with approval, sometimes with regret and uneasiness, that the proportion of clergymen to laymen has diminished

of late years, and that as it is largest among the elder masters it would seem in the way to diminish still further. From this the conclusion is apt to be drawn on both sides that a breach is opening between the Church and the schools, and that one serious step has been taken towards the secularising, or at least laicising, of our higher education.

The case at present at any rate is not so much that the number of schoolmaster-clergy has fallen off, as that it has not kept pace with the rapid expansion of the profession of schoolmasters. Some of the reasons, again, which have kept down the number, point, not to a decline in Church feeling even in the schools, but to a higher standard in it. To name two. This half-century has seen a great growth in the general sense of the sacredness and obligations of the clerical office. Men shrink from motives for taking holy orders, as interested and customary, which in less sensitive days passed without question. Such a reaction, however healthy and necessary, is sure in some direction to outrun a little the limits of reason. We have felt the effects of it both for good and for ill, as the Universities have felt the effects of it. In them, and perhaps in our case too, it was intensified by the heat of feeling and distress of conscience which was one unhappy result of the struggle now set at rest over the "Clerical fellowships." I believe that we as well as they shall feel the good result of that pacification.

Again, as the standard of motives in seeking holy orders has risen, so has the idea of a clergyman's work. There is a more general understanding of the great, the overwhelming task which lies before the Church, and more enthusiasm to take a man's part in it. The curacies most sought are not those where the work is light, but those in which a man can gain most experience, can feel that he is engaged in work most worth doing. In this way we suffer as quiet country rectors and country parishes suffer. It may be that enthusiastic young men undervalue the quieter fields of labour, but this error is generous.

But, whatever be the exact measure or the explanations of the fact, it is unquestionably the case that the proportion of assistant-masters in holy orders in many of the Public schools is smaller than it was a few years ago, and smaller than churchmen may well desire to see. I do not touch any question of the place of nonconformists in our Public schools. I am speaking as a churchman to churchmen, not wishing or dreaming of legislative restrictions, or even of high-handed action of governing bodies or headmasters. Nor, again, do I cast the slightest slur on lay masters. There is room in a large school for considerable diversity of temperament and points of view; there are many members, and all members have not the same office.

No living Winchester man can forget a lay master who spent his lifetime in that great school, beloved and reverenced by many successive generations of Wykehamists, the foremost in every good work in the school and in the town, doing more by his quiet influence and modest life than perhaps any clergyman in the same part could have done to link a new time with the old one in the spirit of dutifulness and sober religion. But we may fully allow that the lay schoolmaster has his place no less than the clerical schoolmaster, and that neither has a monopoly even of good churchmanship, much less of goodness and piety, and yet we may feel that the presence of a body of clergy on the staff of a school is a valuable guarantee that the religious side of school life, and

the pastoral view of a master's functions will be duly remembered. They may be remembered in a completely lay society, but there is not so much to remind either the body or individual members of it. And there is another link in the chain. To the present time the new governing bodies of schools, reflecting, I do not doubt, the minds of a majority of parents, have kept almost entirely to the traditional practice of putting a clergyman at the head of one of the large boarding schools, and hitherto they have had no difficulty in doing so. This would of course be changed if it became a rare exception for assistant-masters to take holy orders; governing bodies can only elect from the best candidates who offer themselves, and in that case the best candidates must be usually laymen. Here again a particular lay headmaster may have a personality which compensates for any external loss, but the lay headmaster generally would have foregone a chief opportunity and engine of influence, and religion would have lost a marked recognition of its supreme place in the scheme and life of the school.

It will be said that the real cause at the bottom of the difficulty of which I am speaking is the state of religious opinion in the Universities, and in society at large. Young schoolmasters are laymen because they have felt, if not the prevalent distrust and dislike of theology, at least the unsettlement of this time of transition. It must, of course, be counted amongst our difficulties—not so much directly, as though our schools were officered to any extent with men whose own opinions were at sea. Work with and for the young, with the conflict of good and evil palpably and constantly before the eyes, is in itself a great clearer of the vision, and a sedative of speculative doubts. A schoolmaster is necessarily a preacher of morality, and a preacher who cannot find sanctions and motives that will bear pressing soon tires of his work. Add to this that even a lay master in most Public schools has to take a part in the general system of religious teaching and observance, which a man can hardly sustain for long unless he has the comfort of feeling that his heart is in fair accord with his lips. But the sense of difficult questions in the air, even if they are not such as at the time to hang heavy on their own heart and conscience, may naturally make some shrink from placing themselves voluntarily into a position where doubt and difficulty would become doubly painful. I do not deny the existence of this motive, nor the gravity of the state of opinion with which it is connected, but I do not believe it to be the single cause, nor even the predominant cause of any reluctance in young schoolmasters to become clergymen. There are many young laymen working in our Public schools who are thoroughly in sympathy with the religious doctrines which they teach, interested in Church work, full of zeal and devotion to the moral and spiritual good of their boys, looking on their task as a sacred charge and ministry, who yet, in spite of occasional wistful looks, hold back from asking the definite commission of the Church to it. The causes of this are of course to a great extent personal, of infinite variety, and wholly beyond discussion; but I may suggest three which I believe to operate, and which consideration may remove:—

1. As I said before, we are living in a time of reaction. Some years ago some men took orders more lightly than they would do now. Such a picture as that which is drawn in an article on this subject in the *Nineteenth Century* for September, of schoolmaster-clergymen, "clergy-

men only from the skin outwards," dates from that time, but it still affects people's judgment. As boys they found a young layman more sympathetic, more thoughtful for their highest welfare than some elder clerical master, and they have not yet had time to correct the hasty generalisation.

2. Another argument, which is also suggested in the same article, is one which has come, if it has truth in it, from the experience of the Universities, or of older life, not of school. It is that the lay master *can do more good* as a layman than he could do by becoming a clergyman, that boys will listen to him more readily, will deduct less from what he says on the ground that he is professionally bound to say it. I am convinced that this argument credits boys with a view which is unknown to them, and beyond them. They have not the experience of life to understand professional bias: on the other hand they have a great idea of persons saying what they "ought to say." They expect a clergyman to speak to them of religious motives, and they do not resent it, but would be surprised if he did not. They deduct, no doubt, something from what either layman or clergyman says, but that is not because he is a layman or a clergyman, but because he is a schoolmaster. On the other hand, I believe that they will often distinguish a clergyman from a schoolmaster. "He said that to me as a clergyman. He was right to say it, and it was true."

3. But that which I believe keeps such men back most is the suggestion, due not so much to their own conscience as to what they gather of the feelings of churchmen about them, that their calling does not give scope enough for what is called *par excellence* "clerical work." This is the view propagated in all innocence by those who utter it, but injurious I am sure to the true interests of religion, against which I wish particularly to protest. It would be possible to point on the one side to large parts of a parochial clergyman's work, or even a bishop's, which are from one point of view thoroughly secular. It is possible also to point to important parts of the work of a master in a boarding school which are in the most technical sense "clerical"—a share in the chapel services, in daily prayers, in preaching, in religious teaching, ministration to sick boys, yearly preparation of pupils for confirmation; but I prefer to put it on its broadest ground. His work is in itself, and therefore in all its details, a clergyman's work. It may be done as secular work—all depends on the spirit—but "Feed My lambs" is as much a pastoral charge as "Feed My sheep." A schoolmaster's life, with its regular and abundant holidays, will give him from time to time opportunities of learning something practically of other forms of a clergyman's occupation, and his own special work will be the richer and more effective for any deepened feeling or widened experience which he gains in this way; but he will come back to his dormitories and his class-room not feeling that he has abandoned "clerical work" till some other holiday time; he will come back to the same problems, the same conflict, the same anxieties and joys which form the life of his brother clergyman in town or country.

I have said that the Church can help us in this matter. All churchmen by their interest and sympathy, but especially (1) *parents* if they enter into it, by letting their feelings be known. It is just such an external "call" as many men desiderate. It is the direction and the

support which governing bodies must have if they are to face occasional clamour and heartburnings in continuing to elect, where it is possible, clergymen to school headships. (2) *The rulers of the Church* (I speak freely in this happy diocese, where sympathy and help are never wanting) by letting candidates for holy orders from school posts feel (a single word often does the good or the mischief) that, so far as their work goes, they are not received on sufferance or with reservations, but welcomed as recruits for a service on which the Church sets peculiar store—by letting the elder masters, assistant-masters at least as much as or more than headmasters, feel that their work is watched, appreciated, recognised.

One word more—it is *worth while* to help in this matter. There are few institutions in which the revival of Church life in its widest sense in the last 50 years has been more visible or more fruitful than in our Public schools. We see school chapels multiplied—their use increased—frequent, short, bright services—sermons adapted to their purpose—sermons in fortunate schools such as those of Arnold or Moberly, Temple or Benson, Butler or Percival—confirmation taking its proper place in school life—anxiously prepared for, impressively administered—lastly, the happy thought of recent years, school missions—missions, I mean in London and other great towns, started and maintained by the interest and alms of one and another of the great schools—bringing boys in a way they were never brought before into contact with the great work of the Church—wakening their sympathies for suffering, forming centres round which old members of a school, when, as soon happens with many, they drift to London, gather naturally and find themselves without effort engaged in personal work among the poor.

The last thing which I wish to do is to give a rose-coloured picture. There is plenty in schools to do—plenty to deplore—but there is effort, and life, and movement in answer to it. All this may continue if they become wholly lay societies, but for myself I should fear a gradual cooling from within. The spirit which makes a proportion of young masters in each generation desire for their work the direct commission of the Church, as a source of strength and a seal of self-sacrifice, is in the long run the same spirit that has given us what is best in our schools, as they were and as they are, and if it loses its power in one direction I should fear its losing it in others also.

The Rev. E. W. Sergeant, late Assistant Master of Winchester College, formerly of Radley and Wellington Colleges.

Superficial observers are apt to misinterpret the undoubted fact of the *renewed vitality of religious feeling* at our public schools, and to conclude that, where so much is well, all must be well. It requires a more accurate study to understand the effects which the spread of secularism and unbelief is producing here as elsewhere, and to appreciate the concessions made or likely to be made to the ever-growing claims of Nonconformity. Religious and non-religious movements have succeeded one another so rapidly in England, their causes as well as

their effects are so interlaced, that it is difficult to determine what is vigorous and growing and what is merely stationary and traditional in the religious phenomena of the day. This consideration alone would suggest a certain reserve in our satisfaction at the undoubtedly encouraging features of Public school religion.

We have reached by various paths no mean summit. The religious enthusiasm of an Arnold, and the clear Church emphasis of a Moberly (to take two prominent examples of scholastic influence), have combined in their separate but converging methods to form, through successive school generations, with all the concurrent help of independent genius in teachers, and all the fostering power of a growing and sustained tradition in the taught, the present healthy, practical, religious tone which influences—I do not say pervades—our best Public schools. We have arrived, I say, at a summit; but a haze surrounds it. The future is uncertain; the present, perhaps, unsafe. Other influences have supervened upon and developed those of an Arnold and a Moberly. The palmy days of empiric latitudinarianism are past. The enthusiasm of early religious liberalism, dealing lusty blows at abuses and superstitions —clearing to all comers the approaches to the temple, but pausing in reverence before the shrine—has given place to the despairing philosophy of Agnosticism; and, on the other hand, Church teaching has advanced, and a revived Catholicism has become, not merely the dream of poets and the instruction of schoolboys, but the inspiring belief of a generation of grown men. These, then, I take to be some of the altered circumstances of the day, which justify a discussion like the present.

But before we plunge into the controversy, if such there is to be, let us be careful to take a fair estimate of the state of things actually existing. If we compare it with that which marked the beginning of the century, it will at once appear how little cause we have, at all events, for regret. As for losses:—here and there the prescriptive rights of the Church may have been cancelled, or may be threatened; a conscience clause, to adopt a phrase from the elementary school, may be in force; lay assistant-masters may be the rule instead of the exception. But, on the other hand, the chapel services are more reverent and decorous; the Eucharist is more frequently administered; confirmations are more frequently held, and more carefully prepared for. It might cause some astonishment, if I were to narrate (as I have them from his own pen) the experiences in some of these particulars of a Public school man* in the first quarter of this century in one of our most distinctively Church schools. Yet what should surprise us where boys habitually rose and went to bed prayerless; where the Communion was received on *ex-officio* principles, without regard to confirmation, for which, administered at long intervals, the only preparation was a question or two in the Catechism?

All this has changed; how thoroughly changed, only those can fully realise who can compare the present state of things with that of fifty years ago. In regard to the preparation for confirmation in particular, it is now felt, I believe, universally in our Public schools, that it is a unique opportunity to be made the most of for boys' spiritual and moral improvement; and parents fully appreciate the pains bestowed.

---

* Dr. Moberly, Bishop of Salisbury.

Nor have these regulative and ceremonial reforms stood alone. The attention of boys and masters has been asked and given to the wants temporal and spiritual of the neglected populations of our large towns by means of missions, as they are called, supported by school agencies; —a movement which, rationally and judiciously directed, is so far from being open to the charge of unreality, that it teaches to some young hearts for the first time that Christianity is coöperative, and religion practical, and that "our neighbour" includes more people than "the fellows in our house" or school.

The present is so bright as compared with the past, that many persons are beguiled into the belief that it affords no causes for anxiety.

Yet there are causes for anxiety; not the less real because they are somewhat below the surface, and are the same which meet the Church at every turn in her modern warfare. The Church is the recognised guardian of a treasury of spiritual truths, doctrines and precepts, to be handed on, taught, and learned, as a priceless gift of God to man, to purify the heart, and direct the life. The spirit of the age is for various reasons opposed to such traditional teaching. It stands to reason that this opposition will be echoed in our schools. Public schoolmasters must inevitably be affected by the prevailing tone of highly educated men. The earnest Churchman, on the other hand, however highly educated, wishes his son to have a definite religious belief. Yet, anxious also to give him the best possible education, he may, as things now are, find himself compelled to commit him to the care of one who, however outwardly conforming, has no real belief in Christianity at all. This, and not anything directly traceable to recent legislation, constitutes, to my mind, the Churchman's real grievance. It is easy to make light of it, but the people who make light of it are commonly those whose views on religion would prevent their feeling it. One cannot expect much sympathy in behalf of those who claim, but fail to get, doctrinal teaching for their children from those whose avowed principles are hostile to such teaching. There may hereafter be—there is already in some countries—almost a tyranny of Agnosticism.

I should be sorry to be misunderstood. That the grievance, such as it is, is at present at all intolerable, I do not for an instant assert. In a free country, and an age of change, there must be compromise and concession; and we may make concessions even beyond what is reasonable, provided we do not compromise what is essential. Parents have a good deal in their own power. They can choose amongst schools, and amongst houses at schools. They can remonstrate, and express their opinions in private and in public; and the expression of such opinions in the proper quarter—even when they are the opinions of a minority—will not be without effect.

It would, perhaps, be scarcely fair to ground an argument on the fact that very High Churchmen are found to send their sons to public schools where, however high the moral tone, the distinctive features of what is very High Church have no existence; where the Eucharist is celebrated with no ritualistic accessories, and the practice of Confession is unknown. The advantages of a first-rate Public school education are so enormous, that much is rightly put up with in order to secure them.

The present is pre-eminently an age for the redress of grievances. Is there none that can be applied to the grievance I have alluded to?

It has been suggested, and this in opposite quarters, that a solution of the difficulty may be found in the appointment of a chaplain or chaplains to conduct the higher religious education and direct the consciences of the boys. I beg respectfully to enter my protest against that proposal. That such a system may work well in certain instances, is possible. But the Public school ideal seems to me to have no room for such officials. I do not desire to touch at all upon the question of the Confessional; but I will say, generally, that I hold that, as the confidences of young children are as a rule best committed to their parents, so the confidences of boys and young men, difficult enough in any case to obtain, are best committed to those who are for the time and in their degree *in loco parentis*—to whose general care and supervision, that is, their parents have confided them.

There are, I am well aware, certain questions which have been raised in this connection—questions in which much more general interest is felt than in any religious doctrine or the prosperity of any Church or sect, upon which I may be expected to say something.

Parents and masters could not but be moved by the correspondence in the *Guardian* in August and September last year.

One correspondent complained of the "entire absence of religious supervision over young boys at a Public school," and suggested that "a great deal of the sin of a Public school might be avoided if the house masters and tutors would take a little personal interest in the spiritual welfare of each boy committed to their charge." Another correspondent, by way of apology, maintained that this alleged neglect was of recent origin, and that things were not so bad "twenty years ago"; while a third threw his shield over us clerical masters, who naturally came in for the largest share of hostile criticism, in the following words:—"Are teacher-priests at our Public schools so much more indifferent than other priests, after all? I cannot remember that any priest, at home, at school, or at college, ever tried to do me any good, except the master at Eton, who prepared me for confirmation."

Now, on the subject of these extracts I wish to make the following very brief remarks:

1. The difficulty *is* mainly with the *young* boys during their first year at a Public school. They require words of kindly warning on their first arrival; they require looking up and having sympathy and encouragement from the house master, and, I would add, from his wife, if he has one; they are in an unfledged, unformed, uncomfortable condition, and may easily slip by a kind of despair, or by ignorance, or by a stupid craving for a vulgar popularity, into bad companionships and bad habits, from which it may take them years to disentangle themselves. Do I think that this necessary help is afforded them? I answer—to some extent, but not sufficiently.

2. I think that the correspondence on the whole did schoolmasters scant justice. Many of the arguments, expressed or implied, either showed ignorance of what is actually done by masters for boys, and of how much boys help as well as harm one another, or else should have been directed, not against them, but against the system under which they work. Of course I shall be accused of partiality; but I will risk

the charge to say that I have never met with any class of men who have seemed to me more conscientious in the discharge of their duties, on the whole, than Public schoolmasters. They have to deal with large numbers; large numbers have their advantages and their disadvantages; but large numbers—and by that I mean large groupings of boys—are part of the Public school system. It is a master's first duty to win over the older boys, and, through them, though not only through them, the others.

Nothing can be better put, or more to the point, than the dictum of another correspondent of the *Guardian*. "Men should make a study of the profession of schoolmaster, as barristers, doctors, and parish clergymen do of their professions." To that statement I will add: Their warnings about sin should be prompt, plain, and unmistakable. Tact and reserve are needed, but reticence is fatal. If they are themselves pure-hearted, they will never sully any pure heart by what they say; and it is unfortunately certain—as shown in an admirable pamphlet by an Eton master—that there is little chance of their ever suggesting the idea of a sin in the way of pastoral and friendly warning which coarser spirits have not previously suggested as a handle for vicious allurement.

The house-master is the proper religious trainer of his boys. It is best both for them and him that he should be so. If he is not a religious trainer, so much the worse for them and for him; but no outsider can adequately take his place. Better to make the best of the present system, however imperfect, than to seek to revolutionise it by a side wind. When it has to be revolutionised, perhaps the grievance may have disappeared, or a better remedy be found.

A revolution in our Public school system which, leaving, we may trust, many of its characteristic features intact, will alter its religious constitution, is not improbable—possibly not remote. Nonconformity will scarcely be finally satisfied without an equal share in all public institutions. The Public schools are commonly regarded as public institutions; and a cry will be raised to make them what is called in modern cant unsectarian.

Those who seek to postpone such a revolution by toning down, till it becomes absolutely colourless—I had almost said, meaningless—the central religious teaching at Public schools, aggravate the very difficulty which churchmen feel. The churchman wishes to have his son, not merely taught in ancient buildings and amidst religious surroundings, but definitely instructed in the ancient Christian faith. The Public schools mainly in view are not day schools. It cannot, therefore, be pleaded that Christianity can be taught at home; unless anyone should hazard the poor joke that its teaching might with advantage be relegated to the holidays. In the case of boarding-schools, the religious instruction must be given at school, if it is to be regarded by the boys as worth having.

But is not, it may be asked, such teaching of Christianity actually imparted at Public schools? What of the sermons, the Scripture lessons, the preparation for confirmation of which you have spoken? I must in turn ask my questioner what he means by Christianity? If he means Catholic and traditional Christianity, my answer must be a mixed and dubious one. It is taught more in some schools than in others; more by some masters than others. The mistaken notion prevails in schools,

as elsewhere, that you can enforce the conclusions of Christianity while neglecting or misrepresenting its premises, and that the spirit of the age may indefinitely modify, without destroying, all our old Christian beliefs. This is some of the haze of which I spoke when I began.

Where, then, are we to seek for our future security in such an altered state of things as that to which we seem to be slowly drifting? I suggest that we are to seek it, if possible, in Church houses. As the secularisation of the Universities does not preclude the existence of Church colleges—that is, colleges definitely committed to Church teaching—so the future secularisation of our Public schools, if ever or whenever it occurs—be it more or less thorough—need not preclude the existence of Church houses. I do not underrate the difficulties likely to arise in carrying out such a change. I have associated it with a revolution. But the difficulties may easily be over-estimated; they would lie rather in bringing the necessary force to bear to compel the carrying out of such an arrangement than in its actual carrying out. I do not believe that it would tend to introduce religious acrimony into school life, or to accentuate differences already existing. If it produced these results, defective management, and not the system itself, would be the cause of the miscarriage. I am not prepared to elaborate such a scheme, or to meet all objections to it; but I may be allowed to suggest it as the churchman's true aim in a not impossible future. I will not suppose that there will ever be a time when the Church cannot command intellect enough to furnish an adequate supply of efficient masters; for were that the case, then she must perforce go, intellectually speaking, into the wilderness, till some prophet should arise to revive her strength and reclaim for her the possession of the Promised Land.

For the present, having that possible future of which I have spoken in view, we may well be content to go on in the main as we are. Many of our Public schools are still by law connected more or less exclusively with the Church. In such, at least, it is fair to claim that the doctrines of the Church should be clearly taught. For, if instruction in Church doctrines is worth anything, its influence will be felt in the individual life; and, the individual life being mainly shaped by early training, instruction in Church doctrines should form part of such early training. It is but too evident that it is the policy of many educationists, backed by the apathy or treachery of some professed churchmen, to squeeze all definite Christian teaching out of education altogether. Children are always either too young or too old, too clever or too ignorant for it. Surely, as a mere matter of information, a young man should be clearly taught the history and significance of the articles of his creed. It is someone's fault if he is left ignorant of them. Often, indeed, he learns what can be said against them before he knows what they really are, and comes to the study of Church history, if he comes to it at all, with a mind wholly prejudiced by the clever sneers of Gibbon.

On the subject before us, and on other even more pressing ones, I trust that we may look for light and leadership to our honoured leaders in the Church. Never were churchmen more ready to follow strong and true guidance. These are no days for weak or ignorant pilotage. If we know that the ship is making for the right harbour, there will be little chance of mutiny on board.

ADDRESS.

The Right Rev. BISHOP ABRAHAM, Canon and Precentor of Lichfield, late Bishop of Wellington.

I DO not understand that, when I have to speak on the Church's influence upon Public schools, I have merely to show how piety and religious emotions may be brought to bear upon the youth in our schools. Doubtless that is one essential province of the Church's work; but genuine piety and religious emotions may be brought to bear upon the lads of Nonconformist schools. I have rather to how how our own great branch of the Holy Catholic Church of Christ—how the grand historical Church of England has influenced, is influencing, and may hereafter influence the great Public schools of the country.

1. Now the specific duties of the Church are in their degree the specific works of Christ Himself; and as Christ was and is Prophet, Priest, and King, so the Church has to perform the *teaching*, or prophetical office, the *ruling*, or kingly office, and the priestly office. I will apply these tests to our Public schools, as regards the past (not going further back than my own lifetime), the present, and the probable future.

2. As regards the teaching, or prophetical work, that the Church did in the early part of this century for public schools, it was almost *nil*. Take this instance:—Archbishop Sumner was an assistant master at Eton about the year 1815. Mr. Justice Patteson was one of his pupils. He told me that that godly man, Archbishop Sumner, never breathed one word to him about religion, or any religious duty, from first to last; and yet all the time Patteson knew that Mr. Sumner was spending his leisure hours in visiting among the lowest class in Windsor—that he was solacing his godly soul with Evangelistic efforts in the most degraded purlieus. Forty years after that, when Canon Furse, as Mr. Carter's curate, went amongst those haunts of vice, he found a man still living in sin, and hating the life he was living, who told him that no man had ever cared for his soul but that one good master of Eton, whom the tone and customs of the school did not allow to breathe a word of religion to his pupils. For some twenty years more, the moral fibre of the school was unstrung and relaxed.

3. And this deathlike torpor held all Public schools alike spellbound, till, to his own honour, and to the benefit of all other schools, that great and good man, Dr. Arnold, broke through all trammels, and asserting himself to be a pastor of the church, as well as a schoolmaster, preached sermons from his own heart to the hearts of the Rugby boys for fourteen precious years. From and about that time, the Church, as represented by Dr. Moberly and Dr. C. Wordsworth at Winchester, by Dr. Christopher Wordsworth and Dr. Vaughan at Harrow, by James Chapman and Edward Coleridge at Eton, dealt with boys as Christian gentlemen, having souls as well as hearts and minds.

4. And if you ask me in what definite modes the Church informed the minds and hearts of our Public school boys, I would say distinctly, By presenting to them what the Prayer Book presents to them—the privileges and responsibilities of Holy Baptism, Confirmation, and the Holy Eucharist. The Church addressed them as members of Christ, children of God, and inheritors of the kingdom of Heaven. In the same spirit they were prepared for confirmation, and "certified by the sign" of laying on of hands that God conferred still greater gifts of his Holy Spirit on them; and the Church led them on to the reception of the very Body and Blood of Christ, in the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper. Such was the teaching or prophetical work of the Church for thirty or forty years, and the moral fibre was strung again, and "all taut."

5. I pass on to the *present* relations of the Church as regards that office. The head masters are still for the most part clergymen of the Church of England; but among the assistant masters *laymen* predominate, and, as far as I can learn, give the prevailing tone to the religious teaching in the schools; and that may be described as intellectual rather than spiritual. I am by no means a "*laudator temporis acti*." As a boy I lived under the old *regime*, and in the transition period. As a master, I lived under the influence of the great Catholic Revival, which began at Oxford; and I can remember one of the leaders of that movement, who used to come to Eton very often, saying that he came there to observe the meeting of the Church and the world. And since those days I have had a son at Eton; and I am bound to say that the moral and gentlemanlike tone is as high as ever, the intellectual standard of the whole school higher, but the teaching, or prophetical office of the Church, has contented itself with what Cardinal Newman long ago called "our common Christianity"—that is, the residuum of belief on which all Christians were agreed. This was to be expected, from the predominance of the lay ἦθος; and instead of the "whole counsel of God," the Public schools teach so much of the Bible as no one can object to.

6. I have not said a word as yet about the kingly or the priestly office of the Church. The ruling work and discipline of the Church has always been exerted more or less in our schools. Even the poet Cowper, who reviled, in his "Tirocinium," the schools of his day, acknowledges the power and dignity of their early discipline.

> "In Colleges and Halls, in ancient days,
> When learning, Virtue, Piety, and Truth
> Were precious, and inculcated with care,
> There dwelt a Sage called Discipline.
>
> * * * * * * *
>
> His eye was meek and gentle, and a smile
> Played on his lips; and in his speech was heard
> Paternal sweetness, dignity, and love.
> The occupation dearest to his heart
> Was to encourage Goodness."—*Timepiece.*

7. I pass on to the priestly office of the Church in Public schools. My Lord, no doubt you will be saying to me,

> "Incedis per ignes
> Suppositos."

I feel it acutely. Nevertheless it would be cowardly to shirk the subject. None of us can read the earnest appeals of parents, especially mothers, in the newspapers; none of us can hear of the *White Cross Army*, and its pure aspirations, without knowing that there is the greatest need of the priestly office of the Church being exercised in our schools, but with the greatest caution and delicacy. May I say one word about my own experience as an Eton master? I never *sought* to exercise that office; I even shrunk from it. But my Ordination vows were upon me; the Exhortation of the Holy Communion required the priest of God's Church to exercise his office when asked for. Wounded and contrite hearts would not be denied; and I can only say that, when I look back upon the results, "Wisdom is justified of all her children;" and I emphatically add that if you eliminate the clergy from the Public schools, you will rob your children of their best heritage.

8. I will now bid you look at the priestly office of the Church in another of its aspects, namely, that which the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews calls (v. 2) μετριοπαθεῖν. The priest is one "who can *have compassion* on the ignorant, and on them that are out of the way, for that he himself also is

compassed with infirmity." May I tell you, my Lord, and this Congress, a story affecting two noble spirits that have lately, and almost at the same time, passed to their rest. One was William Spottiswoode, of Christian and scientific renown; the other was Edward Coleridge, the Eton master. Many of you may have read that William Spottiswoode was at Eton as well as Harrow. I am ashamed to have to say that Eton most unjustly sent away the boy of fourteen years of age for a most petty reason. The head master, Dr. Hawtrey, is a man whose name I can never mention without affection and reverence. On that unfortunate occasion he forgot his administrative skill. He rashly threatened to expel any boy that let off fireworks at the Windsor Fair, on the 5th of November. The thoughtless boy, William Spottiswoode, committed the petty offence, and was dismissed. Never shall I forget Edward Coleridge's earnest appeal on his behalf. The priest of the Church superseded the schoolmaster. The head master pleaded his word and his oath. Edward Coleridge pleaded their common Master's absolving power for master and boy, but in vain. And so Eton lost one of the greatest mathematicians of the century, because the Church had forgotten μετριοπαθεῖν.

9. And now, in conclusion, what are the future prospects of the Church in her relation to the Public schools of the land? Probably in the immediate future the governing bodies and the school staff will be more and more laicised, and the religious teaching will be less and less Catholic. Still, there is a point of view from which even at once I look forward to great strides in advance being made. I look upon the almost universal rule that prevails in every great Public school, that the boys shall maintain a mission in some neglected town parish, as one of the most truly Church movements of the day. I look forward with great confidence to the future of Retreats for masters, and White Cross Guilds and Temperance Guilds for boys. Those are essentially Church movements; and if we can but uphold the Catholic Faith with Evangelical practice, there will be a great future for the Church of England, whatever happens to her.

10. But *how* are we to uphold the Catholic Faith in spite of the tendency to oust the clergy from the prophetical office of the Church? If laymen do succeed, as Kegan Paul in the *Nineteenth Century* wants them to succeed, in ousting the clergy, the injury to society will be greater than what was done in past times, when the clergy virtually eliminated the laity. How is this to be prevented? I only see one way, and that was the course that J. Stuart Mill pursued when he and his colleagues first determined to try and get their principles recognised in the Universities and in Parliament. I learnt many years ago how he and some of his friends, such as Charles Buller and Sir William Molesworth, agreed to master the chief instruments of learning and systems of philosophy that obtained in the English Universities; and then, after mastering them, and their Professors, to substitute the newer and more Liberal, not to say Radical, systems in their place. To this we owe *Mill's Logic* and *Political Economy*, which have so marvellously influenced English thought in the last half century. Well, then, I say the Church, if she is to hold her own in our Public schools, must "insense" and train up earnest young men to be both first-rate scholars and mathematicians, or physicists, and also for the Truth's sake to become clergymen. By merit they will claim their place as teachers, and by the weight of their personal characters they will draw masters and boys to the Cross of Christ, and to the eternal truths Christ's Church is commissioned to proclaim. May I, in conclusion, paraphrase and adapt some well-known mottoes, and say—

Christus docet, Christus regnat,
Christus absolvit, Christus judicat.

DISCUSSION.

The Bishop of Bedford.

My object in asking for a few minutes to-day is simply to bear my testimony to the value of that system which has been already alluded to, namely, the system by which the Public schools have taken in hand mission work in our great overcrowded parishes in London and its neighbourhood. I, of course, naturally look upon that work from the side of those who are benefitted by it in the mission districts themselves. The first acquaintance I had with the work when I went up to London, four years ago, was at the laying of the first stone of the Winchester College mission church, and I had the great gratification of consecrating that church the next year. Since then the parish has been entirely completed, an endowment has been assigned to it from one of the city parishes, and Winchester has (very properly, I think) migrated in its mission work to its own diocese. But we have other work of the same sort going on, and I may especially mention the Eton mission. There are parishes in my East London sub-diocese which fill me with happiness, and there are other parishes which fill me with the very opposite feeling. But I must say this, that of all those which fill me with happiness there are very few which do so more than the Eton College mission district, at the head of which is a worthy nephew of him whom we have so heartily welcomed amongst us here, I mean Canon Carter. Just to give you a small inkling as to the sort of man we have there, and the sort of work he is doing, I may mention that a little while ago he asked me to come and meet the working men of his district whom he had invited to meet their bishop, and to talk over the reasons why working men do not go to church. Of course I gladly went. First of all Mr. Carter asked them to tell us why they did not go to church, or any place of worship, and said we wanted to know what their wishes were, what difficulties they had, and what we could do to improve things, as we felt that they had a right to speak their minds like anyone else. The first two who spoke were very disagreeable fellows; they did not talk about the matter before us, but spoke against religion generally, and we began to think that we had got into a hornet's nest. But after these two had had their say, man after man got up and condemned them, speaking kindly of the Church and religion, and giving us their opinions openly and honestly. With the exception of the two I have mentioned, the tone was thoroughly good, and the discussion was not quite without its fruit; for Mr. Carter tells me the most offensive of the two men has since taken the pledge, and is now a steady man, and, although he does not attend church, he does go to some place of worship, whereas he did not before. Marlborough School has also started a mission, and there again I am thankful to say we have a capital man working, Mr. Noel Smith, who is winning the hearts of the people, and is the right man in the right place. Besides these there are other schools following in the same line. King's College School is helping liberally to support a mission district, although the boys are of a different class, and cannot do so much as those of the other schools named. I visited Harrow, and there spoke to the boys about taking up a mission district, which they have done, though not in my part of London. School after school is catching the infection, and following in their wake. There cannot be a doubt that this work is a great blessing to the poor districts. And now one word about the blessings to the boys themselves. I have had the privilege of speaking about the work at Eton, Winchester, Harrow, Marlborough, and King's College, and if there is anything which cheers one's heart and makes one full of happy thankfulness, it is to see the boys of our different schools throwing themselves heartily into this work, and taking such an interest in benefitting their poorer fellow-countrymen. I do not think they could be more hearty or enthusiastic in any matter—not even in the Oxford and Cambridge race, or the Eton and Harrow match. This is a great blessing to the boys. Surely it is teaching them in the best possible way lessons of unselfishness and sympathy with those for whom naturally they might not have great sympathy: and teaching them, moreover, how to bridge over that gulf between class and class which is such a peril to our social condition. The boys, when they came up to London, naturally visit their mission district, and they there learn something about what the poor are like. They learn that they are of the same flesh and blood and share in a common humanity with themselves, and I cannot help thinking that their after-life will be the more generous and sympathetic for their intercourse with the poor when young. I am quite sure of this, that a lad at Eton, Winchester, Harrow, or Marlborough, whatever his profession in after-life, will,

if once brought into contact with this mission work, be more ready to throw himself into that blessed work of helping to brighten the lot of the poor and suffering—a work in which we do thank God we have so many of our earnest and high-minded laity working so self-denyingly. There is one more point I would mention. I hope many of the boys of our great schools—the best and the strongest and the most intellectual of them—will look forward to working some day more distinctly in this great work, and to giving their lives to labour for God among His poor. I believe, and surely my little acquaintance with East London can hardly deceive me, that there is no career more worthy to fire the ambition of one who is gifted either with high position or with this world's wealth, or with great talent, than the ambition of serving God in one of our great and poor and over-crowded parishes. If you could only see for a moment what a wonderful response there is, when a young man, in the true spirit of English honesty, and English manliness, and English sympathy, goes into one of these poor parishes and stands side by side with the working men, showing them that he has not come there to patronise but to help them as a brother, you would not doubt about the blessedness of the work. The reception such a man will get will fill his heart with joy. It was only the other day that a clergyman, who had come from a luxurious country parish to one of my poor parishes in the East End, wrote to me to tell me of the blessings which came to him every day and filled him with thankfulness, and made his life one psalm of praise.

The Ven. EDWARD BALSTON, Archdeacon of Derby.

OUR Public schools are Church schools, in their foundation, training, end or purpose. Were we to examine their ancient statutes, we should find them agree in this, that they were intended for the promotion of God's glory by the education of the young. Their system of training is based upon individual liberty, and mutual confidence between master and boy. Unlike other schools—as in a French Lycée—the boys are *trusted* out of sight. This principle pervades every part; is a truly Church principle. The end to be attained is the foundation-work of intellectual development—the discovering to each one the existence of more or less mental power, tested and sharpened by conversation, *i.e.*, *being with* others, wherein lies the special advantage of rightly-directed, well-controlled emulation, not to be found except in the midst of numbers, with this one overruling principle thoroughly understood, that the lowest as well as the highest receives his due meed of encouragement and praise, according as he is believed to have done his best. A further end is, the foundation-work of moral development, out of which may grow the fruit of a truly Christian life. The average time during which a boy is passing through a Public school is five years—from 13 or 14 to 18 years of age. The work of a Public school, therefore, is a limited work. It embraces the time during which the child is passing into the man; when the will is strong, bodily activity almost without limit, unwearied; the germ of thought gradually unfolding, and action beginning to be based upon knowledge of rules or principles. Whereas before the child did what it did by impulse, or obedience to others, or in unreasoning innocence, during this period of which we are speaking, he learns to know what is right, what wrong, as applied to this or that action which it comes in his path to perform. Think how this is shown in matters of school duty which he would gladly escape; in the choice of companions, upon which so much depends; in the yielding or not to questionable allurement, or fascinations from within or from without. It is in this first opening of moral life—the first efforts of reasoning power—that the character of the future man is being determined. His surroundings, then, should be of the highest, truest, noblest character. The atmosphere in which he lives should be such as to encourage growth, and give vigour and energy to all branches of his being; but he must be like the forest tree rather than the greenhouse plant—he must learn to endure the trial of evil, as the tree endures the wind and storm, which strengthens and makes firm its roots. The great difference between the Public and the private school lies in the presence of evil. In the private school pains are taken to keep boys out of the reach of evil; in the Public school it is the very essence of his life that he must encounter it; it is that by which he is tried and strengthened. Herein is Church work apparent; and the Public school stands out as the Church's offspring, to do the Church's work. This work may be summed up under two heads—training and teaching; training, *i.e.*, watching the moral conduct; teaching, *i.e.*, imparting knowledge for the development

of intellectual power. I assume this to be the work in which all our Public schools are engaged, and in which they succeed, or they would cease to have the confidence of English parents. As the heart of England is true, so our Public schools, I believe, are true to the Church of England. A whisper to the contrary would soon empty the benches which are now crowded. Let it be shown that any one of our Public schools was other than true to the Church of England, and they would not be in favour, as now they are. I venture to assert that the heart of England is true to the Church of England, and that our Public schools, as Church schools, have on that account the confidence of parents. I further assert what I believe to be true—that the end or purpose which the masters have in view is to train up the youth of this country in the principles of the Church of England, and of no other. The question before us is, whether the Public schools have been and are true to these principles. It is often said that religion is not *taught* as it should be; there is not sufficient pains taken either in training or teaching of boys. Many, who think boys are easily impressed, desire to see them more demonstrative in religious observances; and, where this is not apparent, they are apt to lay the blame upon a system which fails to produce this result. Others who, during these times of deep heart-stirring religious emotion, have felt its influence—alas, as they think, too late in life—have blamed the school, in which such opportunities of early piety were never afforded them. There have been, we know, splendid instances, as at Rugby, under Dr. Arnold, where an influence has been obtained, and a religious tone imported into a school. But we are not all Arnolds. Again, in Canon Woodard's Schools, the original purpose was excellent, and the result good. There is great danger in thinking or trying to make boys religious. We cannot do it if we would; it is God's work in us. Remember, the school is public, not private. We deal with groups rather than individuals—with those who are learning to live out what they know, in whom the natural man is still predominant, for the most part not yet subdued and subjected to the law of spiritual truth. We *teach* in groups—a very different thing from a parent teaching the child who loves him, and is prepared to take in and try to comprehend all he says, because he loves the teacher. With boys at school, the amount of passive resistance in regard to what they are being taught is an important element to be taken into consideration. After much pains and effort made by the teacher, the residuum of profit in what is taught and learnt is too often very small. Hence it is that the training needed for the Christian life is indirect rather than direct. The world was not ripe for Christianity till it had passed through a training of 4,000 years. "The law was our schoolmaster, to bring us to Christ;" how better illustrated than by the teaching of a Christian family in a Christian home? The godly parent desires that his children shall grow up and live the life of true Christians, and he knows he has work to do to "train up his child in the way he should go." How does he set about it? He first teaches him the name of God—the reality of His existence, His omnipresence, His omniscience, His love as a Father towards His children. This knowledge is made practical when the child kneels upon his knees, and offers prayer—"Our Father, which art in heaven." The child grows, and soon, it may be, shows signs of naughtiness. Does the father dwell upon Christian truths, which his child cannot understand? or does he teach him God's Commandments in their application to his faults as he sees them arise? In what truly Christian home is not stress laid, and very early laid, upon the duty of observing Sunday as the Lord's Day, different from others—the duty of obedience, kindness, purity, honesty, truth, unselfishness?—all these things in ways which even a child can understand, and upon special occasions, when the fault occurs, or the tendency to the fault suggests the teaching. Meanwhile the parent watches, prays for, instructs the child, and rejoices if it responds to what he believes to be "the nurture and admonition of the Lord." In process of time the boy is sent to school. Why does the father's heart ache, and the mother's tears run down? Because they know what the evil of the world is; the time of trial for the boy is come; their home training must be tested. What is true of the Church's work in the family life is true of our Public schools. It is not the mere teaching, more or less, of God's word; it is not *always* harping on the knowledge of God Himself and His attributes; it is not any constant reminding of duties long practised at home; it is not jealously watching every movement of a boy, so as to deprive him of free action or self-dependence among his fellows. There must be mutual confidence; the boy must feel himself at liberty—must feel himself trusted. At the same time there must be that in the master which shows that he knows the ways of every boy, and can readily detect the appearance of any evil introduced into him. The transparency of boys' nature is such that ever so slight a shadow passing over the bright mirror of his character discovers itself at once to one who, as a master, is ever

on the watch to mark the onward growth and heavenward progress of his pupil. The love which thrilled the parents' heart must underlie the action of the master also, whose desire must be the same in respect to the end he sets himself to accomplish; and so the Church's work will be done in respect to the oversight and individual care of the whole body entrusted to him. Time forbids me to enter upon the subject of confirmation—that most important element of Church work, that golden opportunity, given to every earnest master, of laying the foundation of truly Christian teaching. One thing I would observe in passing, that if the preparation for this holy rite comes, as it does, in the five years period of a boy's Public school life—if it is desirable, as I hold it to be, that each boy should be prepared by the master who has charge of him, and stands in *loco parentis*, rather than by any other, who is not likely to know what the tutor knows of his own pupil—it follows, I think, as an almost indisputable necessity, at any rate, as a great advantage, to both master and boy, that tutors or house masters should be in holy orders. In regard to the Church Services, great care and wisdom is required. We wish to win boys to them, because of their immense value in forming the true Christian character. My own opinion is, that everything which can be done should be done to render them *attractive;* and therefore music—good music—the best that can be had—should be employed. It was a wise man who said that there is need of music in our Church Services for the poor and for the young. Don't make them elaborate; make them simple, yet attractive, to win boys' love of them. "My lot was cast in a fair ground; yea, I have a goodly heritage," in being connected with Eton. No one knows what the master's anxiety is while the work is going on—how exceeding deep the interest, how great the consciousness of danger, how truly pleasant the regard which springs out of the care of England's youth, brave, generous, and truly noble as they are. Eton has done something for England's weal in the sons she has brought up—great men of all professions, who have come to the front and done good service for their country. Though, as in duty bound, my heart is given to her, I remember she is one only among many Public schools, to each of whom belongs its own merit and its own praise; and none is more ready than myself to join in placing the wreath upon the brow of each, and thanking God for the success He has bestowed upon the work for the happiness and welfare of mankind.

The Rev. GEORGE EVERARD, Vicar of St. Mark's, Wolverhampton.

I WISH to speak a few words from a parent's point of view. My own boy has just left a public school for Cambridge, and as a parent I desire to throw out a few thoughts that, by God's blessing, may help in the practical work of the Public schools. May I say, first, that it is simply overpowering to look for one moment at the stream of lads and young men pouring out each year from our Public schools into our hospitals, our Universities, into all the professions and vocations of our country, and to think of the marvellous influence that that stream of young life must exercise in our land. To think of it for one single moment ought to stir up the hearts of everyone engaged in education to an earnest prayer, that at least what he can do he may do to keep that stream aright. Now, just three or four practical questions. And the first is this. Why may not our dear boys have somewhat of a brighter Sunday than they have had hitherto? I will undertake to say that, in many of our Public schools, the Sunday is the dullest day of all, and the least interest is felt in that day. Why may not our house-masters do something, as was suggested at another session—do something to open their houses and their gardens, and do something to make the lads happy on the Sunday, with a little bright sacred music? The house-master's wife might help in that way to make the Sunday cheerful. My belief is that there is too much of the dry Sunday lesson. If there are to be Sunday lessons, let them be kept within a very narrow limit. But why could there not be something more bright than the Sunday lesson?—a cheery Bible-class on the Sunday evening for our lads, so that they might be talked to, and the practical bearing of the Ten Commandments be brought out, and then, instead of being a dull day, and they wished it Monday again, I believe they would learn to love their Sundays. Another point I would mention. I had a dear relative who was very clever and gifted, and who went up to the University of Cambridge and took a fellowship at St. John's, and he told me that in his Public school, where there were ten clergymen, that all the years he was there he had

never had a word spoken to him personally of brotherly spiritual counsel. I believe that his life would have been a far brighter one than it has been but for that omission. I believe that a few loving words in those early years might have guided him into a very different path to that which he afterwards took. And may I say here, that I hope those in our Public schools who have taken orders will not simply take the position and the advantage, and forget the responsibility. That side must not be forgotten. It is an advantage in position for a man in a Public school to have orders; but let him not forget the opportunities that God thus puts in his way of guiding the lads into the path of life. Of course I am not pleading for priestly dictation based upon the confessional, but I am pleading for loving, brotherly, pastoral counsel. With reference to a remark made by a previous speaker, I believe that the priestly office of the Church belongs to the laity as it belongs to the clergy. I have not forgotten the second chapter of the First Epistle of St. Peter, and that the apostle is there, not speaking to the clergy, but to all Christians as a holy priesthood. Another point perhaps I may be permitted to mention. I do plead for our boys that the Catechism —which I love and value exceedingly—should not be merely dry bones. It was made so to me when I was at a Public school. I heard it hundreds of times, but I never heard a word said which would have made it something more. I therefore plead that the Catechism may be taught lovingly, and such explanations and help given from our Prayer Book and the Word of God as will make that Catechism a reality. For instance, as to the evidences of the Christian faith. We want our Apostles' Creed now; we want to cleave fast to it. Is it possible that a master of a Public school could ever say to his boys something of this sort, "Only do your duty, and believe as you like?" If that be so, let us remember that it is in vain to have a tree without a living root—it is in vain to hang fruit upon a dead branch. You must have a living root, and this root deep in the truths of God's Holy Word, if ever you are to have a living tree bearing abundant fruit. I heartily agree that there ought to be definite Church teaching, and in saying that, I think we must not omit a certain portion of the Prayer Book, which, while I believe it is the very basis of the whole structure, is often cast aside as unworthy of notice. I believe the Thirty-nine Articles of our Church ought not to be forgotten; we should remember the teaching of the 6th Article—the Supremacy of the Holy Scriptures; the teaching of the 9th Article upon Original Sin; the teaching of the 11th on Justification by Faith only; of the 12th, the necessity of Good works. These should be enforced upon our elder lads in our definite Church teaching. And yet, after all that definite Church teaching, it seems to me that all through our Prayer Book—in every article, in every portion of that liturgy—which is such an inestimable treasure—that it all points us up to the mighty and loving Saviour—that it is all summed up in the one great truth from the lips of our Lord, "This is life eternal. That they might know Thee, the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom Thou hast sent." That teaching is in almost every sentence of our Litany, and runs through the whole Prayer Book. Let us not forget to do our utmost to lead our dear boys in their bright young days to the footstool of that loving Saviour, where alone they can find strength for the temptations, and the difficulties, and the conflicts that lay before them. It is as we lead them to personal faith and personal communion with Him that they will find the strength which they need for this life.

The Very Rev. J. S. Howson, D.D., Dean of Chester.

I came here this afternoon without any intention of speaking, and, indeed, with the fixed resolution that I would not take the liberty of laying my card before your lordship. My resolution broke down under the influence of some excellent words which I heard from Mr. Wickham, and I cannot resist the temptation of using this opportunity of attempting to reinforce, from my own strong convictions, one great principle which he expressed so well. That principle is this—that the schoolmaster's office is pre-eminently pastoral. I have found this statement very seriously disputed. And I hope I shall cause no offence by saying that I have observed the opposite view to be maintained for the most part by parochial clergymen. Now what I venture to say is this—that whereas a very large part of the work of a parochial clergyman is extremely secular, a schoolmaster has this moral and spiritual advantage,

that in every part of his work he is in contact with the minds and hearts of his boys. If this view of the matter be correct, then it follows that we may lawfully look to our bishops—and from the remark which fell from another speaker, I gather that in saying this, in this diocese, I shall not be saying anything indiscreet—if this principle be true, it follows that we may look to our bishops to confer ordination—not grudgingly, and with hesitation, but with a large sympathy and willingness—upon the schoolmasters who are engaged in educational work in our higher schools. There is another side to this subject with regard to which something has been said, but about which I think it desirable to say more. I refer to the question of confirmation. I am not speaking at random, but with a good knowledge of the subject, when I say that there is no moment so hopeful for spiritual results in the period of school-boy life as that which is connected with confirmation. And here comes the question as to whether it is desirable—I include the case of the more important day schools, as well as other schools where boys are removed from their homes—but speaking generally, the question arises whether it is desirable that school boys should be prepared for confirmation by their clerical schoolmaster or by the parochial clergy? I have heard the matter put in this way. The parochial clergyman says "that is our only chance of getting hold of these young people for the future." And that is true. But in reply, I say that what you, the parochial clergymen, know of these boys with regard to opportunities for spiritual benefit, is as nothing compared with what the clerical schoolmaster knows. He has seen them at all times, he knows their faults, has their personal confidence, and his position has given to him what a previous speaker has well called that unique opportunity for the future, which is absolutely invaluable. Here let me interpolate one word in connection with this question of confirmation. I am persuaded that the clergy are far too timid in regard to plain speaking to boys at such a time. So far from any danger resulting from plain speaking, the boy will honour and respect the clergyman, who is thus preparing him, for such plain speaking. He knows that his spiritual helper at that time understands him, and it is a very great risk to practice reticence upon a point where there is great danger. And may I interpolate another remark, and speak a word to fathers? The connection of the school and the home is a subject of which we may not lose sight. Fathers are too shy in speaking to their sons; one great danger of domestic life is this—lest boys should grow up strangers to their fathers, and their fathers strangers to them. And if only fathers would speak to their boys at the most critical time of their life upon the most difficult and delicate of subjects, and then kneel down with them in prayer, and ask for the blessing of Almighty God, then some of those moral evils which we so much deplore would, under God's blessing, be very largely diminished. I will now limit myself to one point of detail. It would be still possible that this clerical training might, as in a French Lycée, be not in the hands of a head master. But what I would urge is, that although the work of the clerical assistant masters is of infinite value, and although they have opportunities which the head-master has not, yet, for the real well-being of the school, I myself think that where there is the supreme power of discipline and punishment, there also should be the centre of the highest religious teaching, and the most intimate religious encouragement. It is by no means the same thing if this kind of teaching and training should be in the hands of assistant masters, and be withheld from the head master. On the contrary, I apprehend a very great and serious danger to the religious tone of our higher schools if it came to this, that the head masters are to be chosen only for high intellectual attainments, while the intimate religious instruction and training are relegated to inferior officers.

The Right Rev. the PRESIDENT.

I VENTURE to interpose because two references have been made to the practice of this diocese in respect to the admission of schoolmasters to holy orders. It stands thus: the titles to orders in the Canon are limited to parochial cures and to fellowships in colleges, or other employments in the Universities. A very great change has taken place in the condition of our schools, and of our Universities; and that has necessitated some change in the practice of admitting to holy orders, founded on the 33rd Canon. The whole subject has had to be reviewed, and I

have felt myself justified—here I speak only for myself—in departing considerably from the strict requirements which the Canon seems to lay down, and I have admitted as titles to holy orders assistant masterships in many schools. It might seem, and I think it has been partly suggested here, that it is desirable to extend that very widely, and to allow the position of a teacher to be in all cases a title to holy orders. I cannot quite take that view of it. It is true that teaching is an excellent work, and belongs to the pastoral office, but not necessarily the teaching of propositions of Euclid or the elements of Latin grammar. Teaching, if it does not include in reality the pastoral care of boys, is a high function of the clergyman's office; but all teaching does not include that, and some clergymen have no charge of boys beyond that which consists of hearing from them elementary lessons. There is another consideration which you ought to bear in mind. The Prayer Book requires that anyone admitted to the Order of Priesthood shall be "spent in the things belonging to the ecclesiastical administration;" he shall know by experience something of a clergyman's duties. And it is the bishop's business to ascertain, as far as he can, that the men admitted to priest's orders have by that time gained some acquaintance with the ordinary duties of a clergyman, and have learned something of a clergyman's life. There is thus a limitation of the general principle, which I have endeavoured to act upon, that the teacher's office is a qualification for orders, and I am bound—sometimes very reluctantly—to ask, almost as if restraining a candidate from holy orders, "Have you, besides teaching your boys, learnt something of what are the ordinary duties of a clergyman, so that—for this possibly may occur—if you were to-morrow presented to a benefice, you would not go wholly inexperienced to the cure of souls?" I wish to put this consideration before you. I could have said a good deal more about it; I say so much, however, because the matter is not to be decided wholly in the interest of the masters. The bishop has duties and circumstances which he must take into consideration respecting the welfare of the Church at large. But I do say that it is my most earnest desire to see the Church still hold the keys of the great door of education which admits the children of the upper classes into public life. I earnestly desire to see all our masters in our great schools—if it might be so—endowed with the grace of orders; and I should be glad to ordain more of them, as I have already ordained not a few. May God in His mercy grant to this country that she may see those who are to take a high place in her councils, taught by men who hold the true faith of Christ, and who have that commission which we trust is granted them in ordination to feed the lambs of the flock.

The Ven. GEORGE ANTHONY DENISON, Archdeacon of Taunton.

I SHOULD have been very unwilling to leave this Congress without saying a few words in connection with the subject now before us. The matter upon which I am about to speak is so vast and so deep, that it would be absurd to try even to deal with it in any sufficient manner within the time of ten minutes. I should be very glad indeed if my dear friends who are opposed to me upon the matter would consent to meet me in some convenient place, where we could fight it out well and quietly. We cannot do it in our several ten minutes. Now we are in the year 1883; and it is 41 years this year since I first began fighting the "School in England" question against the civil power. But, in 1883, we are brought face to face with a proposal for a movement entirely and absolutely new and strange to the Church of England, and, indeed, to the whole Church Catholic, in respect of the "Church school"—we are brought face to face with this at the hands, not of the civil power, but at the hands of churchmen. The proposal is this, that there shall be schools of a public character in the Church of England, "on the principles of the Church of England," which shall have annexed to them the "conscience clause." Now I need hardly say that I hate, have always hated, the "conscience clause." I have hated it in its germ for 41 years; but I never hated it so much as I do now when it is proposed to us for acceptance, not by the civil power at all, but by churchmen outside the grasp of the civil power. I remember eighteen years ago, at the Congress at Norwich, I found time in

fifteen minutes to give seventeen reasons against the possibility of admitting conscience clauses into Church schools, and I remember my dear friend, who was also my tutor at Christ Church, a late Archbishop of Canterbury,* writing to me and thanking me for my seventeen reasons, and also saying it was utterly impossible to have such a thing as a conscience clause in Church schools, but we have lived to see in 1883 a proposal of that kind made upon the same highest official authority. But I may be allowed to say this, I trust there may be time at least for a reconsideration of the proposal; for I contend it is impossible to have what is called a Church of England school with a conscience clause—that is to say, free admission of scholars for secular instruction only—without destroying the *raison d'etre* of the "Church school." Are churchmen going to use the weapon of their antagonists, the weapon by which the civil power have well-nigh killed the "Church school in England." I pray for some consideration of what is proposed to be done. Let me cite from a great poet, in the language which I am afraid is dying out of England, about the use of weapons not fit to our hands—

"Tugue prior, tu parce, genus qui ducis olympe,
Drojice tela manu, sanguis meus."

And for those, who persuade themselves that they are doing a work of "charity" in promoting the school of the Church School Company, let me cite again—

"Solitudinem faciunt, Pacem appellant."

The Ven. W. Emery, Archdeacon and Canon of Ely; Permanent Secretary to the Church Congress.

By permission of our President, I rise to say a few words in reply to what you have just heard. Archdeacon Denison looked round at me, as considering me to be the champion of the conscience clause, to which he so strongly objects. Well, I will at once say that, during the last 30 years I have certainly watched the progress of this question of the conscience clause. When I was a young fellow of a college in Cambridge, I read very carefully the debates thereupon, especially the remarks of Archdeacon Denison, and I have followed the matter ever since. My own firm impression from the whole is, if the Archdeacon will pardon me for stating it, that the great opposition to allowing the conscience clause in our National schools, and in our public schools, with the persistent opposition made to anything of that kind, in the form of permission to parents who dissented from special religious instruction to withdraw their children, has been one of the most powerful influences for the extension of secular education, and for the introduction of Board schools. I know I am not alone, by any means, in this conviction. Whatever may be the opinion of Archdeacon Denison upon the point, this is quite certain, that now, not only in our National schools, but in all our public schools, the conscience clause has been introduced. With respect to the Church schools now proposed to be established, it is the deliberate judgment of many well entitled to speak on the point, including the two Primates, and many of the bishops and leading Church laity who have taken special interest in education, that if a new movement to establish Church schools for the lower middle class, between the great public schools and the National schools, is to succeed, a fair amount of liberty must be left to the parents or the guardians of the children with respect to religious instruction, otherwise the field of day school education for the middle classes will have to be left to Secularists, Nonconformists, and Undenominationalists, who have already occupied much of the ground. This is the real issue. I am very sorry that the words "Conscience Clause" have been introduced in the matter. The phrase misleads the public. Our proposal is not to introduce the "Conscience Clause" in the same way that it is generally used and practically carried out in our National schools. The right of withdrawal to be granted in our proposed day schools will have nothing to do with a time clause, which people associate with the conscience clause, giving religious instruction only at the beginning or end of the school time. The Church Schools Company is, after all, a voluntary effort of churchmen to meet the practical difficulties

---

*Charles Thomas Longley.

and needs of the day. It does not intend and does not wish to introduce a technical conscience clause, but to give what it is contended is a reasonable permission, to such parents or guardians whose children have been accepted as scholars, to withdraw them, if they so deem right, from the religious instruction. Let us look back a little, when Archdeacon Denison speaks of the terrible results which have ensued from the like permission in the past. What has been the effect of the introduction even of the stringent conscience clause in our National schools or our Public schools? How many parents really withdraw their children from religious and Church instruction? We know, as a fact, scarcely any have availed themselves of the right. Do let us, then, be practical, and not merely theoretical. I venture to say that the introduction of a conscience clause has saved, to a great extent, even religious education in our National schools, and has helped much to mollify and remove prejudices. Must it not be so, seeing that large numbers of our dissenting brethren, and others who differ from us, send their children to our schools, where there is a conscience clause, and do not withdraw them. But one word more with respect to the right of withdrawal proposed for our new Church schools. Let me give you the argument of the Lord Archbishop of Canterbury on the point. His Grace is a well-known educationalist, and has had, of late, experience of a high school for girls, at Truro. In that school —a Church school, with right of withdrawal—there were children not only of Church-people but of dissenters. They were not withdrawn, however, from the religious instruction, but they would, it is believed, never have come under Church instruction at all if there had not been liberty of withdrawal. I have ventured to mention this because it is very important, as coming from his Grace. But still further. We should look on this right of withdrawal in another way. It secures the right to the teacher to give full Church instruction. What the Archbishop has urged on this point should carry great weight. If you do not concede the right of withdrawal, and yet permit nonconformists and others to send their children to school, the teacher will, his Grace urges, very often, from good feeling even, be inclined to tone down the instruction, lest offence be given; but if there is the right of withdrawal, then the teacher may, without scruple, give full religious and Church instruction, for if any objection is made to the teaching, the answer is plain, "You can withdraw the child, if you think fit." I do therefore entreat of churchmen not to raise objections on the score of the conscience clause, against what I believe may prove a most important and far-reaching movement of the Church for the education of her own children, or for bringing back into her fold a large number of those whose parents, for one reason or another, have not been very friendly to our Church. Remember, we are dealing in this matter with the middle classes; and if there is a weakness in the Church of England, you know it is that the middle classes are, to a considerable extent, at present alienated. Therefore, as it is said they have been alienated by the faults of the Church of England, we should try, now that the opportunity offers itself, to approach them in a liberal spirit, for the good of mind and soul alike. Knowing that differences exist, let us throw the responsibility of withdrawal upon parents and guardians, whilst doing our best, fully and honestly, according to the principles and doctrines of the Church of England, to instruct those who are committed to our charge.

C. T. Murdoch, Esq.

I have been waiting, in the hope that some other layman would have addressed you upon this subject. I say that to me it is a matter of personal regret that no layman has done so. I am compelled now, at this late period of the day, and after what I may call the verbal duel between the Archdeacon of Taunton and his adversary, to beg your attention once more to the subject which is under discussion, and which, as I believe, we have sadly wandered from. Now, what is the subject under discussion? Is it not simply this? How we are amongst our noble Public schools so to inculcate that true religion which is preached by the Church, that the members of these Public schools, when they go out in after life, may carry with them that religion which will enable them in their several stations to further the interests of the Church. Let us look for one moment of whom our Public schools are composed. You must remember this, that the boys who form the majority are boys who hereafter will in their life, no doubt, become the people of influence. Many of them from birth will succeed to seats in the House of Lords, and will have

to legislate, in all probability, on matters connected with the Church. Now my opinion is this, that although we know that in our great Public schools the head-masters and the heads of houses do according to their best ability teach religion, yet I can hardly believe, from their very position, they can get as well to the hearts of the boys as those who have made religion their business and study. I know in this that I am trenching upon rather delicate ground, but I do believe this, that boys are critical, and also that it is to their interest that those who address them upon religious matters, should do so carrying with them the mark of religious training. I am not saying that the head-masters and the masters of houses do not do this, but I do think that to a certain extent, certainly on the Sunday, the religious teaching should be separated from the ordinary scholastic teaching. How is it, I ask, that in the great Public schools the religious teaching is, generally speaking, confined to a certain amount of reading of the Greek Testament, and to what are called Sunday questions? My own idea is this—that if you would gain possession of the boy's heart, you must carry on that same amount of religion which he has learned at home, and that you must do it by those who are clergymen, and who have been appointed for the purpose. I must say that I should like to see on a Sunday, in our great Public schools, religious instruction conducted by persons specially appointed for the purpose, who would, as far as possible, take the boys in small numbers, and who would, therefore, I think, obtain more influence. Depend upon it, if religious teaching were made a more important point of in the Public schools than now, we should not hear those complaints which were heard this morning, of young men coming up to the Universities who had not that amount of religious instruction that they ought to have been possessed of. And then I would say, that I believe there is another method of gaining the boy's hearts, and that is, that the preachers who preach the sermons in our great schools should be specially appointed for the purpose, and be men eminent in preaching ability. Boys are, we know, critical; and, I believe, the majority of them, when they leave their chapels, do carry away with them thoughts of the sermon they have heard, and if that sermon is made of a character to appeal to their hearts, there will be an incalculable amount of good done.

The Rev. Dr. Wood, Vicar of Cropredy; formerly Warden of Radley College.

I should like to say a few words from the parents' point of view. We have been asked this morning whether the Christian life will continue to flow into the Universities, and the questioner has answered himself that this depends, in great measure, on the schools. The schools again, through their representatives, have informed us that much turns on the parents and the home. No one of these bodies can transfer its responsibilities to the other. Many boys in both the upper and middle classes, as well as in the so-called working class, come out from homes where, if parents have the desire, they have not the capacity or the leisure for instructing their children properly in religious knowledge. The Public schools are bound to give the best religious teaching, and to afford adequate guidance. Schools and Universities have alike improved in many ways, but a good deal of this is merely the reflex of the more refined tone of society. Much remains to be done by those to whom the young are entrusted in what has been appropriately called the "seed-time of life," and parents have a right to look especially to those masters of schools who are in holy orders to carry this out. Much has been said by previous speakers of the improvements effected in our great public schools. How is it, then, that in some of the most important of them (which I will refrain from specifying) so little consideration is shown for the Church's rule, and for the natural requirements of boys, as actually to have no early celebrations?

The Rev. H. B. Gray, Warden of Bradfield College, Reading.

The connection between the Church and Public schools is a subject which I think yields in importance and interest to none of those great questions which have engrossed the attention and stimulated the sympathies of speakers and thinkers here this week.

We have discussed within these walls the proper attitude which the Church should assume, the proper action it should take in adjusting and Christianising the relations between class and class, sex and sex—between the employers and employed, between churchmen and Nonconformists. But who are we who adjust, or talk of adjusting these relations—furnished with what mental and moral apparatus do we come—whence is derived that equable, and by no means boisterous tide of eloquence and learning and vigour, which has flowed from all parts of the country during these few days of Congress? I think I hardly exaggerate the case when I say that three-fourths of the listeners, and certainly nine-tenths of the speakers, owe much of their religious aspirations, and certainly most of their intellectual endowments, to the training and associations of Public school life. The fruit of the tree of knowledge is here; the roots lie deep underground in those institutions of learning, with some of which I am proud to claim connection, and working their way deep into the human soil. And in another way we have a claim on the attention of the Congress here assembled, and on clerical England generally. We, the Public schools and the artisan clergy, are the two phenomena which are peculiar to English life. We are historical institutions—monuments of bygone piety and learning, which have coloured, and, if it please God, will continue to colour the national life, and make the English character such as it is to-day. And if we look at the immediate past, we cannot fail to see another bond of connection, viz., that the same forces have been at work in both. The same magnetic impulse which converted the religious slumber of the eighteenth century into the religious enthusiasm of to-day has not been unfelt by us. Fifty years ago, the scholastic air became charged with electricity. We had been long asleep—endowments had been frittered away—there was no system, and much waste—there began to be much talk of misapplied funds, wasted endowments, uneducated boys. Then came to be invented that phrase of the dead hand which was lifted to point its own disgrace. Arnold opened a new era in the history of our Public schools, and since then, among trustees and schoolmasters, there have been great searchings of hearts. Organisation has succeeded chaos—energy, waste, the boys of our Public schools play better and work better than they did fifty years ago, notwithstanding the paralysing power of examinations which is continually pulling up the plant to see how it is getting on. We have life organisation in our games, in our intellectual societies, in everything but one, and that is external work for the cause of Christ and His Church. Now, it is this difficulty that we call on those in high places most respectfully to help us to correct, to assist us in organising some sort of missionary effort which will redound to the praise and honour of God. I am aware that one or two of our larger Public schools are supporting separate and distinct enterprises of this kind, but we in the smaller schools have neither the position nor the finances at our disposal to embark on such an undertaking unaided. But if, by episcopal sanction, such a grand co-operative scheme on the part of our Public schools be set on foot, with that great unknown heathen land, the east of London, as the field of its labours, it would prove not one of the least successful or important efforts in furthering the work of Christ and Christ's Church on earth. And the reflection of such a mission on the character of our public would be incalculably great. One of its effects would be to draw, I doubt not, the hearts of our best Public school boys to enter that sacred ministry to which their youthful endeavours and self-denial have endeared them; and if such effort be undertaken, free from any bias of party prejudice or narrow sectarian views, as it would be if recognised and overlooked by the archbishops and bishops of the land, it would serve to rivet more closely the bond which exists between the Church and its lay members, since such bond would be strengthened by that most tender and lifelong of all tender memories—the holy aspirations and yearning impulses of a Christian boyhood.

The Rev. A. Carr, late of Wellington College.

I wish to bring two points before the Congress. 1. The diminution in the number of clerical masters in Public schools. 2. The relation of clergy working in schools with clergy working in parishes. As to the first, though the number of clerical teachers, both in the Universities and the Public schools, has diminished, that diminution has been compensated by the greater zeal and sense of responsibility which distinguish the present generation. No one now takes orders so

as to hold a fellowship or a mastership. Still, it will be disastrous if this diminution is continued, and, therefore, facilities should be given for the ordination of masters in Public schools. On this point the bishop's words have been kind and promising. It is to be desired that his lordship's words and principle should be adopted by the whole of the episcopate. As to the second point, the interests and the work of the clergy in schools are one and the same with those of their parochial brethren. It is desirable, therefore, that there should be a closer alliance between them, and that the work of clerical schoolmasters should be recognised, and felt to be recognised, as the work of genuine and valued labourers in the Lord's vineyard.

TOWN HALL,

THURSDAY AFTERNOON, OCTOBER 4TH.

The Right Hon. SIR JOHN MOWBRAY, Bart., M.P., in the Chair.

THE TREATMENT OF ELEMENTARY EDUCATION BY THE STATE IN ITS BEARING ON VOLUNTARY SCHOOLS.

PAPERS.

The Right Hon. J. G. HUBBARD, M.P.

I HAVE been asked to address the Congress upon "The Treatment of Elementary Education by the State, in its Bearing on Voluntary Schools." Elementary education means, of course, the education of the young, the imparting to them such rudimentary learning as may enable them to acquire deeper and more varied knowledge. Education in its fullest and truest sense, is the process of cultivating, developing, and instructing the faculties of man, so as to fit him for the fulfilment of all the objects of his being. And here differences of opinion may arise; but it will not be questioned in this Congress that man has an immortal soul, and that, this life ended, he will rise again to an eternity of weal or woe. The objects of man's existence are, therefore, in our sense, the fulfilment of his duty as a citizen of an earthly kingdom, and the attainment of his inheritance as citizen of a heavenly kingdom. In education, which is to qualify man to discharge his civil duties, and to lead a religious life, the chiefest and most enduring purpose must be ever kept in view. A system embracing all secular knowledge, but excluding religious instruction, could with no fitness be designated education, although some would contend that secular and religious training may be wholly separate in the work of education, and that civil duty and religious duty may be considered, taught, and practised irrespectively the one of the other.

These preliminary remarks lead to the assertion of the principle that

"Education is a religious work;" and that it is an essential in the religious liberty which is the acknowledged right of every Englishman, that he should be subject to no pecuniary penalty or legal hindrance while conducting elementary education as a work in which religious is blended with secular instruction. Whether religious education enjoys the perfect liberty to which it is entitled is the enquiry which I now propose to consider.

Differing from the modern theory that "Education" was invented by some ingenious men at Birmingham within the last twenty years, I contend that education, in its highest sense, has been coeval with the Church, and that the combination of secular instruction with religious training has, in England, been effected through the foundation of Church grammar schools following quickly upon the Reformation period. The seventeenth century witnessed a large extension of private foundations for primary education; it is claimed for Bishop Ken, as a distinguished promoter of learning, that he set up a school in every parish of his diocese; and we may be sure that, in his schools, neither letters nor religion were neglected. The Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, instituted in 1698, found a wide field in which to exercise its educational efforts, until it was relieved of that duty by the foundation, in 1811, of the "National Society for the education of the poor in the principles of the Established Church." The "British and Foreign School Society," and the "National Society," effected a sensible advance in the instruction of the labouring classes through the application of funds spontaneously subscribed, and their efforts were still more successful when they were assisted by parliamentary grants, beginning in 1833, and regulated from 1839 by a committee of the Privy Council constituted as an "Education Department." During the whole of the period I have named, this feature is noticeable as a condition of State assistance. "No school could be aided either with building or annual grant unless it were either (Revised Code, 1869, Art. 7) a school in connection with some recognised religious denomination, or a school in which the Scriptures are read daily." I beg your attention to this point, that up to the year 1870, the voice of the Church, the voice of Parliament, and the voice of the State united in affirming that religious instruction was an indispensable element in education.

We have now to observe how this prevalent opinion and sentiment was disregarded and set aside.

Mr. Robert Lowe assumed, in 1859, the office of Vice-President of the Committee of Council on Education. He disapproved of Denominational or Religious schools; he considered it his duty not to apply the moneys voted by Parliament to their destined purposes; to save the Government grants he threw every conceivable obstacle and discouragement in the way of school founders, and in this course he was so successful, that the building grants, which had reached £137,000, in 1859, were dwindled down to £19,000 in 1865.

The paralysis in school extension achieved by Mr. Lowe gave occasion to the cry that "the voluntary system was a failure;" and in 1869 the Birmingham League sprung into a vigorous organisation, devoted to the establishment of "a system of education, rate-supported, compulsory, free, and secular." Yielding to the impulse of this movement, the Government presented to the House of Commons a measure

honestly intended, which eventuated in the Elementary Education Act of 1870. It is our present purpose to impugn, not the provisions of the Education Act, which, with its successive amendments, is now the law of the land, but the way in which by its administration it has injuriously affected Denominational schools. That stringent measures for extending education were needed in 1870 is undeniable. With the increasing educational wants of the population of the country the ancient endowments of the Church were wholly unable to cope, nor had the efforts of Nonconformists supplied the deficiency. New centres of labour grew rapidly into towns, with their thousands of souls, located, of course, within some parish, but practically outside the old ecclesiastical charge, and needing more churches, more schools, and more clergy. These, however, being objects for expenditure and not sources of profit, rarely came within the sphere of duties acknowledged by railway companies, who, with other large employers of labour, chiefly companies, have been mainly instrumental in creating new hives of human activity. Of the school accommodation in 1870, the Church of England had provided nearly three-fourths, but the entire provision was admitted to be inadequate. The denominational efforts then pronounced a failure would have presented a very different result if, instead of being subjected to the discouraging and depressing rule of Mr. Lowe, they had met with a wise and sympathetic assistance. The increase of Church schools, doubling their available accommodation, upon the passing of the Act of 1870, proves that with equal zeal on the part of other religious bodies there would have been comparatively little left for the State to supply through its direct intervention. Before the Act of 1870 was passed, Churchmen had provided accommodation for 1,365,080 scholars in 6,382 schools, erected at a cost of £7,507,940, of which voluntary liberality had supplied £6,270,577. By August 31, 1882, the accommodation was raised to 2,385,374 places in 11,620 schools, costing £13,119,557, of which voluntary liberality had supplied £11,604,172. What were the inducements and the expectations which had impelled Churchmen to spend these additional five millions and a quarter in the creation of new schools? We will see.

The authors of the Act of 1870 repeatedly declared that it was brought into the House with no intention to injure the Voluntary schools or preclude their extension. There should be efficient schools everywhere; but Board schools were to be placed there only where the necessity for them was proven. They were to supplement and not supplant the Denominational schools; and that these should, so far as the zeal and means of their supporters allowed, occupy the educational field, a building grant was promised to every Denominational school which within a year should be notified to and approved by the Education Department. The Board schools were, like the Voluntary schools, to receive Fees from the children and Annual Grants from the State; but the School Boards were moreover empowered to levy rates for the maintenance of the Board schools and the assistance of Denominational schools. The rate, it was estimated, would not exceed 3d. in the pound. "I do not believe it will amount to anything like that in the vast majority of cases. . . . It was not probable that any charge for the purposes of the Bill would exceed 3d. in the pound," were the assertions of Mr. Forster, confirmed by Mr. Gladstone, who

spoke, on July 7, 1870, "of the limit of the permanent burden, as reduced by Mr. Forster's proposition, to 3d. in the pound." As the school rate, levied on all liable within the school district, would be an extraordinary burthen on those who supported Denominational schools, School Boards were empowered by clause 22 to assign a share in the rate to Denominational schools. In lieu of this equitable provision surrendered to the secularist opposition, the Government promised that Voluntary schools should receive an enlarged grant of 50 per cent. as a maximum—so limited, that the only amount they would receive . . . would be less than it would cost the ratepayers to establish a Board school. Here, then, were the expectations held out to Voluntary schools. The inducement—the paramount inducement for churchmen—was the duty of providing a Christian education for the people; of averting, as far as possible, the strife-stirring School Boards; and with expectations founded on the assurances of Mr. Forster and Mr. Gladstone, they did not scruple to undertake and fulfil the gigantic task of doubling the accommodation in Church schools, and they now ask that the expectations which have been raised shall be realised. In answer to a memorial setting forth their case, we have been told that the Government grant has fully increased by the stipulated 50 per cent.; an undoubted fact, but in no degree allaying our grievance, for we complained, not that the grant was not increased, but that the increase was outweighed by the increased cost of education consequent on the new and onerous requirements of the Department. The proportion of the cost per head of each child in Church schools falling upon voluntary offerings is as large now as it was in 1870, and, the number of scholars being doubled, the necessary offerings are doubled also. Churchmen do not complain that their zeal in doubling their schools doubles the area of demand upon their liberality, but they do complain that the proportionate burthen is unrelieved according to promises which they deemed as reliable as actual enactments. Even if the promises I refer to had never been made, I should hold our claim to consideration incontrovertible upon its own merits; for briefly, what is our case?—and in our case I include that of Roman Catholics, Wesleyans, and all Denominations having schools in connection with their religious worship.

The State decrees that every child in the country shall be educated; and, deeming education to be a necessity for every child, attendance is made compulsory, and enforced by fine upon the negligent parent, who is also bound to pay the stipulated fees. A Government grant measured by results in secular instruction is awarded alike to Voluntary and to Boards schools; the excess of expenditure beyond fees and grants being provided by private offerings in the case of Voluntary schools, and, in the case of Board schools, by a school rate levied on the local community, including the supporters of Voluntary schools in the same school district. Of the entire school rate of £1,800,000, Churchmen pay the larger portion (not less, probably than £1,200,000), they contribute the use of schools, which have cost them £12,000,000, and they pay in addition £600,000 annually in personal subscriptions for the satisfaction of a national requirement such as should, therefore, be satisfied by moneys raised equably upon the whole nation. If the average Government grant of 15s. per child were increased by 50 per cent., it would

about cover the voluntary subscriptions, and it would not exceed the limit stipulated by Mr. Gladstone in the debate of 1870—viz., that the relief to Voluntary schools in an increased grant should not enhance the cost of education given in them beyond that incurred in Board schools. For 1882, the cost per child in Board schools is £2 1s. 6½d., of which sum grants and rates together make £1 11s. 6¾d., as a charge on the public. The Government grant to Church schools of 14s. 10½d., if increased by one-half, would be £1 2s. 3¾d. as the cost to the public of each Church scholar, or 9s. 3d. less than the charge per child in Board schools. And let this fact be the conclusive reply to the sectarian intolerance which would refuse all State aid to Denominational schools upon the pretence that it would aid to propagate denominational doctrines. Of the results of Denominational education, those flowing from religious training are the most precious; but for these not a farthing can be paid from either grant or rate, the aid of the State being strictly limited to secular learning. We do not ask for the full satisfaction of our reasonable claim; we do not desire that in Voluntary schools there should be no place for religious liberality and self-sacrifice on the part of their immediate supporters. An increase in the grant of one-fourth would reconcile Church schools to their difficult position, and could not reasonably provoke complaints in any quarter, for it would more nearly bring the whole nation under contribution for what is affirmed to be a national necessity. Another method has been suggested of doing justice to Voluntary schools, by their admittance to a share in the school-rate; but to this arrangement it is loudly objected that it is contrary to the very nature of a rate that it should be applied to a purpose not under the control of the ratepayers. If this argument proves anything it proves this—that an education rate is an anomaly, since it raises from the whole community moneys to be applied in a manner on which the most serious differences are entertained. It must be admitted, however, that an enlarged Government grant is the simplest and most practicable solution of the educational difficulty, and I have encountered but one objection to its adoption. "It will operate," said an emiment official of the Education Department, "most unjustly in this way. Town A. has a School Board, and rates itself for the maintenance of its very efficient Board schools; town B. has none but Denominational schools, and joins in the cry for a larger Government grant, which would involve more taxation. You ask to tax A. for the relief of B.—monstrous." We parted before I could show my friend that his formidable difficulty was no difficulty at all. The additional grant would reach all schools alike; it would lessen the pressure upon private offerings in town B., but it would, in the same proportion, lessen the pressure on the rates at A. All schools, Voluntary and Board, would share in the relief obtained by bringing under contribution the whole community for a national object, and that the relief be not abused it will be essential that an effective restraint be imposed upon School Boards who have hitherto indulged an uncontrolled and lavish expenditure.

We have been told—we are told—that this grievance might be remedied and, this struggle ended, by the conversion of our Church schools into Board schools, and we are asked when will we surrender them to the painless extinction which is considerately prepared? Our answer

is, "Never!" and they who ask the question must (if they are in earnest) be strangely ignorant of the power which underlies the calm and steady resolution of religious Churchmen. Education with us is a religious work. Religion to be real must be definite, and if definite, will be Denominational. Our schools must, therefore, be managed by churchmen and taught by churchmen, and the religious instruction given in our schools must be that of the Church of England. In saying this I do not affirm that the education conducted by other Denominations may not comprise a religious instruction real and definite; I do not even deny that in Board schools religious instruction may be given perfectly sound, doctrinally and practically. This result may be attained without Catechism or Prayer Book, but it implies a united Board supporting an earnest and skilful teacher well versed in Scriptural truth. How rarely in the very nature of things can these conditions be found in School Boards, and how much more frequently the peace which pervades a pattern Board school owes its existence, not to the influence of religion, but to its absence. I quote from the *Nonconformist* of April 20, 1882, some remarks peculiarly apposite to the question now before us. The author of the article writes:—"Make the Board schools secular; the so-called undenominational religious teaching is a failure in nine cases out of ten. Where it is really undenominational it is not religious. It may be historical, geographical, grammatical, or even theological, but it is not religious. Where it is religious it is not *un*denominational. . . . . On this subject we have heard an anecdote, which we believe to be authentic. The London School Board holds an annual examination of its scholars in Scripture, and prizes to the most successful children are distributed at the Crystal Palace. On the first occasion on which this *fete* was held, a gratified spectator remarked, 'There is no longer a religious difficulty.' One of the ablest members of the Board, and one of the sincerest friends of religion, replied—'That is because there is no religion.'" This extract from the *Nonconformist* illustrates very distinctly the relative position of Denominational and Board schools: in the one harmony prevails, because religion rules with unanimity the education they impart; in the other—with special exceptions—if harmony prevails, it is "because there is no religion." We are not disposed to surrender to the trumpet blast of secularism. With the God-fearing men of every religious persuasion in the country, we will persevere in rearing our youth in the faith of their fathers, and we demand that, as citizens of a free country, we shall not suffer for the exercise of our religious liberty.

I. Henry Wilson, Esq., Priory, Caversham, Chairman of the School Board, Reading.

To those who desire the continuance of the Voluntary school system, the subject of our enquiry cannot fail to be of great practical interest; and this, not only on financial grounds, but also as it involves the question of the encouragement or discouragement of the charitable support of schools for the poor.

We have to look into the relationship now existing between the State and the Voluntary Schools, and to ascertain whether there is any cause of complaint which may be fairly urged against the treatment which they receive at the hands of the Government.

And this enquiry will necessarily bring to our notice the position of the more recent system of rate-aided schools, and we shall set the two systems side by side, and endeavour to determine how each is affected by the Education Acts, and how far the balance of advantage may preponderate to either.

It is not our object at this moment to weigh their respective merits as educational agencies. We, who are here assembled, have no doubt on this point; and it is in our anxiety for the well-being of our Church schools, which form so large a portion of the Voluntary system, that we desire to search into and establish our claims for a reasonable consideration at the hands of the State.

We ask if the treatment of these two agencies is equal at the hands of the State. Are the laws, by which our Public Elementary schools are governed, strictly impartial? Do they, as far as it may be deserved, afford to each system its just and equitable amount of consideration? Or, is it the case that the older system, by which the education of the children of the poor has been hitherto voluntarily maintained, and at so large a cost during the greater part of this century, has, since the year 1870, been permitted to struggle with embarassments from which the modern system is made free?

And for the purpose of this enquiry we must be first satisfied that the merits of the Voluntary system are such as to claim, with justice, an equal amount of consideration. For if it could, with fairness, be alleged that there has been, or is, any degree of failure in Voluntary school work which is not found in the School Board system, we should be ready to admit that unequal claims may justly expect unequal treatment.

We have then to show, as I think we may, that in all respects the Voluntary school is equally well able to accomplish the object of Primary Education with the School Board school; and we have to prove, as indeed we can, that the maintenance of the Voluntary system is as important to the State, for the purposes of Elementary Education, as the rate-aided system; and, perhaps, even more so in respect of its power to extract from charitable sources vast sums of money which, otherwise, might be less well expended,

When these grounds are established, we may, I think, fairly urge our claims for consideration, and proceed to ascertain how these claims have been met by the State.

What, then, is the history of the Voluntary system? and how are its claims established?

Let us for a moment refer to the last report of the National Society, and we shall readily find an answer.

It is there stated that £27,380,130 have been expended by the Church on the building and maintenance of Schools and Training Colleges during the last seventy-two years, and this, of course, in the full trust that so vast an outlay for the welfare of the State would at all times be recognised and upheld by the Government.

Since 1870 £5,333,595 have been contributed by churchmen for

School building, and the Church of England gives annually about £600,000 for educational purposes.

On August, 31st, 1882, she had.....2,385,374 School-places.
The British Schools.....384,060 „
The Wesleyans.....200,909 „
The Roman Catholics .....269,231 „
And the Board Schools...1,298,746 „

The increase of places in Church schools during the past year being 34,139, as compared with 23,856 for the year preceding.

In the ten years from 1870 to 1880, the increase in average attendance in Church schools was 918,665.

The Roman Catholics, urged also by a dread of Secular Education, raised £390,000 in the same period, and provided 71,518 additional school-places.

In 1870 the population of England and Wales was about twenty-two millions, and the Church of England had then provided accommodation for about ten millions of the people, as represented by 1,765,944 scholars, whilst the Nonconformists had school-places only for 411,948 scholars, representing about 2½ millions of the population; and yet the class of schools now solely endowed by a State-tax is exclusively suited to the opinions of those who, if not adverse to, are at least not in union with, that body to which the country owes so much the larger debt for educational work.

The Church offers more school accommodation than all other agencies combined; and whilst the tide of educational Church income flows on unabated, we cannot but realise that her schools have met with a growing favour at the hands of the working classes, who, we may therefore justly conclude, prefer a definite method of religious teaching.

We find in the schools of all Denominational bodies nearly thrice as many available places as are at present provided by School Board schools, and the joint educational contributions of such bodies amounts to the annual sum of nearly one million.

These are facts of pregnant meaning to the ratepayers of England; for to replace the older system by the newer, is to impose upon them a needless burden of great magnitude; and thus it becomes a matter of paramount importance to the ratepayer to defend and strengthen that system by which he is relieved from additional taxation, and, as far as possible, to support those schools which are connected with a religious community.

But having seen that for financial reasons the Voluntary system merits consideration, we have further to ascertain its educational results, and to ask if these results are such as to possess claims on the State for aid.

And it appears hardly necessary for this purpose to do more than to refer to the earnings of the scholars of each system, and here we find so little difference, that we may assume their educational merits to be about equal.

The Voluntary school child earns 15s. 9d.; the School Board school child, 16s. 2d., for the past year.

Here, I think, we may rest on our claims.

If we have shown that there is a vast financial gain to the interests of the country from the existence of the Voluntary system, and, further,

that the education provided by it is sound and successful, we may surely consider our position established, and proceed to enquire into the treatment we have received.

How, then, are the claims of the Voluntary system entertained by the State?

In the debates which took place on the introduction of the Elementary Education Act, in 1870, Mr. Forster distinctly pledged himself that School Board organisation should be only supplementary, and that Denominational agencies should not only incur no harm, but, in fact, acquire additional strength; and, no doubt, the strain has proved their strength—but we have not to be grateful for much external aid, rather has the spirit of the Church been awakened by new difficulties to new exertions, and the liberality of churchmen has been redoubled, lest the interests of the Church and of Christianity should suffer.

Mr. Gladstone, too, at that time suggested that additional aid, of a special character, should be given by the Privy Council to Voluntary schools, by increasing the annual grant in their favour.

And we cannot but here note in referring to Mr. Gladstone's language of 1870, and to his reply of June 15, 1883, to a memorial from the National Society, that he appears to have left his former position and to be satisfied now to taunt the Church when reminded of her great efforts in behalf of National Education, by remarking, "That her contributions and her difficulties result from undertakings voluntarily entered upon under the provisions of the Act, and with full knowledge of the amount of public assistance to be expected."

This reply from the Prime Minister embodies briefly the treatment of which we complain.

We are now told that no promises have been broken, but that we have been mistaken in trusting to words of high official meaning spoken by the Statesmen of 1870, which words however, fell just short of promises, and were calculated only to stimulate the Church to fresh efforts by raising inferential expectations of support never to be verified.

It was also proposed in the debates of 1870, as a possible expedient, that School Boards should make grants towards the maintenance of Voluntary schools.

From these references to what then took place it is evident that the future condition of Voluntary schools was then a matter of some prominence in the minds of our legislators, and that an apparent anxiety was exhibited that they should be fairly dealt with.

The event has in a measure justified these anticipations, and although through the vitality of our system we have no cause for alarm, we do, nevertheless, complain that as far as the State is concerned, and but for the energy which has been stimulated by difficulties, the result might have proved disastrous.

Now let us look at our real position in reference to the State, and we shall find it to be a fact that one distinct class of schools only, in which are educated about one third of the National scholars, is in receipt of the produce of a tax, amounting last year to two millions, and levied alike on all the rate-payers of a school district. 1882, England 1,741,964; Wales, 95,194.

We have to except only from this calculation that small proportion

which is expended on the enforcement of school attendance, and which so far no doubt benefits Voluntary schools.

And this tax has so increased in amount as to cast a very much heavier burden upon the Voluntary school supporters than was originally anticipated. It was stated both by Mr. Forster and Mr. Gladstone in the discussions on the Act of 1870, that 3d. in the £ would probably be the limit, whereas it has reached an average in England of 5s. 5d., and in Wales 6s. 1d.

A churchman, it must be allowed, has, or ought to have, the same liberty with a nonconformist, a Christian with an atheist, of holding his own opinion as to the best form of Public Elementary schools, and the same prospect of Government support; and yet the School Board school system, being, as it is, more adapted to the views of the nonconformist and the atheist than to those of the churchman or the Christian, possesses the sole legal claim for aid from the tax by which the School Board school is subsidised, but of which the Voluntary school receives nothing but the advantage of an aided school-attendance.

The denominationalist is twice taxed, once by his conscience and once by the State. The noncomformist, the atheist, and the indifferent person pays only once for the school of which he approves.

Two ratepayers, living side by side in otherwise equally rated houses, pay unequally in this respect, one under compulsion to schools of which he disapproves, and also voluntarily to those which he approves, the other under compulsion, but with perfect content, to those schools only which he approves.

Is it just that the Education Tax paid by all should be given by the State to one class of schools only, which represent the opinions of one class of persons only, viz.: such as desire secular education without the obligatory teaching of religion?

This class of schools, in fact, alone is subsidised, whilst other schools equally well adapted for all secular ends, but including religious instruction as an integral part of their curriculum, and representing a vast proportion of popular opinion, are not only without this endowment, but are condemned for their religious qualities to struggle on by the voluntary aid of persons already taxed for an educational system which they do not approve. And yet it cannot surely be supposed that a Voluntary school child will grow into a less valuable citizen or subject of the State than a School Board scholar.

The Education Laws may, without doubt, be said to endow and to strengthen noncomformity, secularism and atheism; or, at all events, such is their tendency.

The present state of things is as objectionable to the Churchman, the Roman Catholic, and the Wesleyan, as it would be to the secularist, the atheist, and certain noncomformist bodies, if this endowment were exclusively bestowed on schools of the former denominations. And this injustice is the less called for when we consider that the difference between the two systems consists in a matter which is set right for all parents who object to definite religious teaching by the application of the Conscience-clause, so that a child who shelters himself under this provision becomes a secular scholar only.

It seems to me it would be a less injustice if the nonconformist and secularist were compelled to pay a tax to the Voluntary system with the

Conscience-clause in operation, than as it is now for the Voluntaryist to be compelled to pay to a system where it is permitted to exclude religion altogether. Thus, whilst one section of the community has its schools subsidised, the other section finds no favour with the State, and stands by unaided.

I do not question the propriety of an Education-rate. The education of the children of the poor is, no doubt, a proper object for rate-aid, but I question the method of its application. If the tax were available for all, and all must be qualified by a voluntary subscription in order to receive the benefit of the tax, the case would admit of no complaint.

And what is the remedy?

There are several. An additional grant from the Privy Council might be made in favour of Voluntary schools; or each Voluntary school child might receive so much from the rate; or the ratepayer's voluntary subscription might be *pro tanto* set off against his rate; or he might select the class of schools to which he desires his aid should be given; or the amount of the rate apportioned to each school, of whatever class, might be given in proportion to the amount of voluntary aid in each case; but by whatever method, we affirm that all should share alike, and that those who value Denominational schools should be placed on the same level with those who value secular schools, and that all honest and sound educational efforts should be fully recognised, considerately utilised, and brought into a just and fair combination with the great educational machinery of the country.

There is, I know, a common objection offered on the ground that Voluntary schools being under irresponsible management ought to receive the produce of no tax, but they are inspected by H.M. Inspectors, and this is a sufficient answer.

I have thus briefly endeavoured to draw attention to the treatment of the Voluntary system by the State, and to place before this Congress the circumstances and position of the supporter of that system, and I venture to assert on his behaif that the same degree of liberty is not accorded to him, that partiality to one class of opinions is exhibited, that equal aid is denied, that voluntary effort is discouraged, that the religious training of children is crippled, that engagements remain unfulfilled, that a great debt of gratitude is practically ignored, that the present success of the Voluntary system is rather in spite of, than by virtue of, the Government, and that, whilst we do not for a moment despair, we urge our claims, and ask to be heard on the merits of our case.

We appeal to a Christian Government on Christian grounds, and we assume our right to speak on behalf of a system which we value, because we believe it to hold out the best prospect of maintaining Christianity, and we assert that a too-rapidly advancing secular education needs the admixture of a high, moral, and religious culture, to meet and to check its attendant risks, and we believe that this can in no way be secured but by the inculcation of definite and fixed principles of religious teaching.

Upon these principles we base our educational system, and administer the work of our schools.

We maintain their equality in all secular respects to the rate-aided schools, and we ask to share with them an equal consideration at the hands of the State.

ADDRESSES.

Sir Edmund Hay Currie, M.L.S.B.

It is impossible to form a sound judgment upon the question of Elementary Education without taking into account the state of things existing in this country prior to the year 1870,—the year made memorable by the passing of that Elementary Education Act, which cannot but be regarded, from whatever point of view, as one of the most beneficent legislative achievements of modern times. When the subject was approached by the Government in that year, they found, among the many difficulties with which it bristled, that *three* things were clear :—1st, that an educational machinery overspread the country to an immense extent ; 2nd, that that machinery, though inadequate, was *efficient* ; and 3rd, that the deficiency which was palpable required the construction of some powerful engine for supplying it. The engine selected was the principle of rating. It was declared by the Government, and their declarations were endorsed by an overwhelming majority of the House of Commons, that, while it was the duty of Parliament to aim at making elementary education universal in an efficient form throughout the country, it would be absurd and inpolitic not to make use of whatever machinery existed which might be effectual for this aim. To say nothing of the waste of money which would be the result of a destructive policy, it would be unjust to the promoters and supporters of the existing machinery, by whose benevolent and self-denying labours such great success had been obtained, not to recognise and uphold their work. *To supplement, and not to supplant*, must be the motto of the new scheme. The principle of rating was to supply the deficiency. Local boards, appointed by free popular election, were to be called into being, whose duty it should be to provide whatever schools might be necessary for educating the population at the expense of the community. These boards were to be subject to the supreme authority of the Privy Council, and were to be required to obtain their sanction before erecting any new school. Evidence of the *existence of a want* must be given before a single brick could be laid. From the point of view of the *Statesman* it was of first importance that the elementary education of the people should be adequate and efficient, and that there should be no waste of public money in providing it. Now it cannot be doubted that upon almost every other subject these simple principles would have commanded universal assent, but the education question involved other considerations of a delicate and difficult nature, which greatly entangled and obscured it, and which have given birth to controversy after controversy down to the present moment. The schools actually in existence were for the most part connected with the Established Church, under the management of the clergy, and largely supported by the voluntary contributions of Church people. Were the people then to be compelled to send their children to a school where they would be brought under ecclesiastical influence in which they did not believe? or was a compulsory system of education to be rendered impossible, for *the want* of a school against which such an objection could not be urged? or was the existing Voluntary school to be crippled, if not ruined, by the competition of a new school, backed by the limitless resources of the local rates? This was the "religious difficulty." It was unknown up to this moment, but now it grew to immense proportions (at least, in the minds of some), and had it not been for the common sense of the House of Commons, it would have hindered the progress of the nation for, it may be, half a century. But a *modus vivendi* was discovered. The idea of a "Conscience Clause" was no new one ; it had been adopted in the elementary schools for many years previously. It

would infringe the first principles of religious liberty if the funds of the State were to be applied for other than secular results. It would be easy to apply this method, which had worked successfully hitherto, to the enlarged operations which would result from the new scheme. These facts are only dwelt upon to show how it was of the *very essence* of the Act of 1870, that Voluntary schools should be recognised as efficient, and being efficient, should be preserved and maintained. Let us now pass on to consider how this scheme has worked. It was clearly wise and equitable; what have been its practical results? I think we may say that they have been more satisfactory in the country than in the large towns. In the country there has been little difficulty in preventing *waste* through the provision of unnecessary schools, while steps have been taken to secure that every child should be brought within the network of the national education. In some places Voluntary schools with a Conscience-clause, in other places rate supported schools have supplied every educational want. In towns, however, it has been different, and specially so in the metropolis. This was, perhaps, only to be expected, in consequence of the enormous population which had to be provided for by Voluntary effort. A census taken by the School Board of London revealed an appalling destitution of educational machinery, and it was felt that prompt and vigorous action was necessary to wipe away what was at once a national reproach and a national danger. And here let me pause for a moment, to say that whatever we may think of certain isolated actions of the London School Board, which have been freely canvassed, it is impossible for any candid observer who cares for the education of the masses of the people, to refuse to its policy as a whole, a meed of gratitude and admiration. Tens of thousands of children have been brought under education who could never have been provided for by Voluntary exertions, and if the energy of some few of its more enthusiastic members has been somewhat exuberant, we must remember that the immense difficulties of the work have supplied abundant ground for leniency of judgment in regard to their operations. It cannot, however, be denied, that these operations have in some cases acted prejudicially to efficient Voluntary schools. The erection of Board schools in close proximity to them at a lower fee has drawn off many of their children, and the compulsory rate has reduced the number of Voluntary subscribers; and while their income has thus been seriously diminished, their expenditure has been increased through the raising of salaries, and the necessity of providing additional appliances, to enable them to compete at all with the Board schools, whose income is practically unlimited. It is this state of things which demands some remedy, and to which I desire to draw your attention. It cannot be to the interest of *anybody* that the Voluntary schools should be destroyed. They are educating the majority of the children of the country. They produce results in every way equal to the Board schools. They enlist the active sympathy and support of the clergy and laity of the Church of England. They are free from many of the acknowledged weaknesses of the School Board system, *notably that* of the want of any personal interest in, and sympathy with the teachers and children. Their destruction would entail an enormous pecuniary burden upon the people at large, and yet, unless *something* is done, their destruction, at least in towns, is only a question of time. What should that something be? Many suggestions have been made, but there is, in my judgment, only *one* solution which is feasible, and which is free from objection, either on political or religious grounds, and it is *this:* Let the Government grant be raised to such an amount as will render it possible for any efficient school to be maintained by *it*, together with the pence paid by the children, without any necessity for Voluntary subscriptions. Such a solution would be in harmony with the avowed principle

of the Act of 1870, would commend itself to the judgment and feelings of Church people, and could not, in my opinion, be objected to by *any*, except those who will be satisfied with nothing except the *death* of the Voluntary schools.

The Rev. ROBERT GREGORY, Canon of St. Paul's.

WE have heard three such excellent papers, that I fear there is little left for me to say. There is, however, one special reference I wish to make to what has been affirmed. When Sir E. Hay Currie claimed so much credit for the London School Board, I must demur to what he said. As a past member of the Board I should very much shrink from giving to it a tithe of the praise which he claimed for it. I served on the Board for three years, and found myself frequently in a different lobby to Sir E. H. Currie; and I feel that a good deal was done by the Board on a principle that I for one cannot endorse. I now wish to call attention to the very different position in which religion was placed in our elementary education by the Act of 1870; it was altogether different to that which existed previous to the passing of that Act. Before that Act was passed, it was agreed on all hands that religion was necessary for the moral as well as spiritual training of all the children of the country—that the great end of education was not simply to teach people to discharge the ordinary duties of secular life, but that there was a moral being in man to be cared for, and that our education was imperfect unless we did our utmost to train children so that they might become not only skilful but honest tradesmen—that their lives might be pure as well as successful—unless we taught them that there was something higher and better than the results which can be measured by pounds, shillings, and pence. The point, then, apparently understood by all, was that this necessary side of education must be based upon something; and we, as a Christian nation, sought everywhere to base it upon Christianity. The Nonconformists did this just as churchmen did, and one and all taught the children of their own Church or denominations the truths of Christianity as they understood them. What is more than that, they based their moral training on such spiritual instruction. The two were looked upon as so closely united, that if you knocked away the support of the religious principle you thereby endangered the superstructure of moral practice. And so closely was this principle interwoven with the educational system then patronised by the State, that it was difficult to obtain the consent of the Education Department to the establishment of a school which was not in connection with some recognised body of Christians. Since that time, you will see how essential a difference has come over the spirit of the dream of, at all events, a portion of the governing authorities of the country. They have enacted that educational rates shall be levied only for schools from which the teaching of all distinctive religious truth is excluded. Whenever we say that we churchpeople must teach our children according to Church principles, in order to make them honest and true and just, because we know no safe basis on which to teach the duties of Christianity except the doctrines of the Church, they stigmatise the Creeds, and the Catechism, and the Prayer Book with the name of "sectarian" teaching, and say they cannot apply the money of the country to sectarian teaching, the word "sectarian" being emphasised as much as it possibly can be. What, I would ask, is the meaning of "sectarian"? Something cut off. I should like to know from what the Church and her doctrines have been cut off. Is agnosticism, or scepticism, or materialism to be regarded as the solid body, and Christianity as a severed limb? Do the former denials of Christianity include the

mass of the population, and Christianity only a small minority? I hope and believe not. But it is desired to implant some such impression. The word is used to create a prejudice against the teaching given in Voluntary schools; and the secret of the opposition to the teaching of religion in Church schools arises from a fear that if children learn the religion of the Church, they may likewise join the political party with which the Church is supposed to be most closely connected. The good or evil which may arise to the children is not regarded; their future moral welfare is treated as though it were a matter of no account; their highest spiritual interests are altogether ignored; and the only thing deemed of importance is the success of the political party to which these opponents of religious education belong. I once had a striking illustration of this. I was talking to a member of Parliament about the Universities, and he asked what effect the admission of Dissenters to the Universities had had upon their religious opinions. I said I had been told that not infrequently they had drifted into agnosticism and unbelief, but that I was not aware of many having joined the ranks of the Church. "Oh, then," he said, "it makes no matter." In other words, it made no matter that they had lost all faith in Christ, all dependence upon Him, all hope of salvation through Him, because such loss of faith was not likely to change their political bias. One can feel what is in the minds of the persons who employ those words, "sectarian teaching," and we must deeply deplore that, in their desire for the success of their political party, they should become indifferent to the spiritual interests of their fellow countrymen. You and I think it is necessary to teach religion, not to make members of this or that political party—the thought of this never enters our minds—but because we mean to make people moral and good citizens, because we know no other effectual influence for preserving children and women from vice and crime but the Grace of Jesus Christ. I am aware that our schools were not infrequently attacked in the past, on the ground that the religious teaching given in them was so excessively dogmatic that the Nonconformists could not bear to send their children to be instructed in doctrines of which they disapproved. To my certain knowledge, I can affirm that the fault in religious teaching given in our schools was that, in our extreme anxiety to be fair and liberal, and not to bias children against the professed faith of the parents of some of them, we shrank from being as definite as we ought to have been, and this all recent investigations have fully established. The altered system has necessarily interfered with this; and with so many schools where distinctive religious teaching is not given, such teaching in our schools has become more definite. It is quite impossible to make any kind of religion influential for the great work it has to accomplish in overcoming the evil passions and desires of our nature, unless that religion assumes a definite form. If you think of what man's nature is, and of what its tendencies and promptings are, you will see how difficult is the task, how severe the strain, to which the religious principle must be subjected, and how useless any instruction in its truths must be, unless such instruction is definite and distinct, and so able to withstand the assaults which are certain to be made upon it by the world, the flesh, and the devil. It is obvious that the religion we would implant in children's minds, to be effectual for the great end it is designed to answer, must be based upon a clear and definite creed. Bearing this in mind, what should be our position with respect to the effort now being made to destroy our schools? I use these words because, as some of you may have seen, part of the Radical programme of the future is announced, by a magazine which affects to speak in the name of the party, to be the destruction of all Voluntary schools. Mark you, this proceeds from persons who would say that one of the essential principles by which government ought to be carried on is the religious liberty of the people. How can we have religious liberty if our denominational schools are to be destroyed,

and the whole body of the children of the lower classes are to be taught in secular schools, where no definite religious instruction can be given? Is religious liberty to mean liberty to deny God, and the truths of Christianity, but not liberty to believe in these blessed Truths, and to teach them to others? People often say, "How very much could be done by parents at home, if only they would teach their children the religion they know." But all who have had any experience of large parishes, and of the poorer members of the working classes, must be aware that parents have not leisure, ability, or opportunity to give their children such instruction, and the children are practically dependent on what they are taught at our schools. The effect, therefore, of withdrawing definite religious instruction from our schools, must be that a very large part of the population would practically grow up without any instruction in or knowledge of Christianity. Consequently, when asked to surrender our denominational schools, we must remember that the effect of such action is far-reaching—that it includes much more than the opponents of these schools dare at present to avow; it amounts to a surrender of the religious teaching which is their distinguishing feature; and so we must ask ourselves if we are prepared to give up Christianity, for that is what it amounts to. Are we prepared to say that this country must no longer be reckoned amongst the Christian countries of the world? We have but to look at the effect of non-religious education in some of the countries on the Continent. France is rapidly drifting into a system in which religion is entirely excluded from education. What is the effect on the population? Does it make them more orderly? does it make their Government more stable? does it give any sense of security and happiness to the people? does it cause them to respect any more the rights of neighbouring kings and potentates and peoples? does it place them before the world in a position we should like to imitate, or, rather, are they not a warning to us, and a beacon, showing us what to avoid, and teaching us to do whatever we can to support the religious system of instruction? The destruction of our elementary schools means the destruction, as far as possible, of religious education of all kinds. For the Roman Catholics, the Wesleyans, and others who have schools of their own, depend, to a great extent, on the success of our Church schools in resisting the attack made upon them. It is not too much to say, that if our schools succumb, theirs must soon follow. I am certain that, come what may, a certain proportion of our schools will not be lost to us, whilst I feel equally clear that, unless something is done for their support, others must go. I speak for myself, and I am no pessimist, nor am I given to despair; and if I were a parish clergyman, I would rather sell the coat from off my back, or the surplice in which I minister, or the vessels of the altar, or anything else, than part with my Church schools, because I think the future of the Church and country largely depends upon the education given in our schools. It is the children whom you can train and influence. It is with them as with the products of nature; if you allow the tree to begin to grow in a wrong direction, there is little chance of its being afterwards bent aright. But whilst I feel thus strongly, I fear that all my brother clergy and lay managers do not feel equally strongly. I dread lest the obstacles placed in their path should prove too much for them. I entirely agree with one of those who have preceded me, that we ought to require of the State a larger share of support than we have yet received, and that we have not been dealt with fairly or equitably. We may talk about persecution in the past, but we have persecution in the present, for we are now fined for teaching religion. In the name of religious liberty, therefore—in the name of all that is fair and just—I demand a large percentage of assistance from the public purse for the maintenance of our Church schools, so to place them on a more equal footing with the Board schools. We are determined to maintain our system by every means in our power, and we do hope

that a strain will not be placed upon it which may prove stronger than some of our brethren can bear. We do trust that religion will not be treated as a political question, important only as affecting the ephemeral interests of party politicians, but as the great moral and spiritual influence upon which men's present and eternal interests are dependent; and that we shall be allowed to do our utmost to train the children of our own people in those Church principles which will make the England of the future greater and better, more religious and God-fearing, than the England of the past has been.

DISCUSSION.

The Rev. J. COWDEN COLE, Vicar of Upton, Somerset.

No apology is needed by any person for speaking on the subject of education. For wherever we go, whether among rich or poor, educated or uneducated, in the gutter or in the mansion, in the Houses of Parliament or in our parochial assemblies, we find that an opinion on the subject of education is equally acceptable. I suppose you are familiar with the two last debates on Elementary Education in the House of Commons; and you will have no doubt noticed what diversities of opinion were expressed by the different members who took part in those debates. The prevailing idea seemed to me to be that the members of the House of Commons thought that the children of the working classes of this country were of that mental power that you had only to put them through any course of education you choose, from the a, b, c, to the integral calculus, and you would be sure to receive some return for it. It was said, for instance, that a course of science ought to be included in the subjects children should be proficient in. I believe I am correct in saying that that was the substance of the two last debates on Elementary Education in Parliament. A few weeks after reading the report of those debates, I happened to talk with a mother whose children were attending one of the Board schools of the great town of Bristol. I took the opportunity of endeavouring to obtain some practical knowledge of the working of the present educational system, as it was viewed by those persons, who, I venture to think, are much interested in the question, namely, the mothers of the children themselves. That mother said to me, exactly what is continually being affirmed with regard to the elementary education of the country, that it takes a much higher standard than is absolutely required for the children of artisans. I am not going to stand here and say that the artisans of this country are not entitled to the best education it is possible for their children to receive. On the contrary, when we view the interest they have taken in the election of the various School Boards, we can see that they really take a deep interest in the efficient education of their children. But I venture to think that what has been termed the "hard-headed" class of artisans —the men who are accustomed to make their way in the world—can hardly be considered fairly representative of that larger mass of persons of weak bodies and weak minds who go to make up a considerable portion of the population of any country. That weaker portion is fully represented, I think, by the mothers of the children. I asked the woman to whom I was just referring, "Did she think it well for her children that they should have lessons to do out of school-hours?" and she said that she had quite enough trouble to keep them out of mischief, and she did not like the additional duty which was imposed upon her, of seeing that they did their lessons when they came home from school; she also said that it seriously interfered with the children's play-hours. Now we talk some times of robbing the poor of certain advantages they may happen to possess; and I ask, if it is a thing at all suitable that the children of the poor should be robbed of their play—of those few hours which are necessary for their home recreation? The present system of elementary education, I am afraid, does conduce to that end; and, therefore, the more we can return to the former system by which the children were taught to regard the powers of Church and State as those of a nursing father and a nursing mother, the more I am convinced it will place the educational standard of the country at a point not impossible for the children of the poor to reach, and under which also they will obtain the greatest amount of happiness and well-being it is possible for them to possess.

The Rev W. Foxley Norris, Rector of Witney.

I only wish to address myself to two principal points. In the first place, I wish to meet that feeling which during a rather long ministry I have heard repeatedly expressed amongst my neighbours, after both clergy and laity have been looking on with a kind of despair at the treatment of education by the State, when they have lost heart and said :—"I suppose *we* must also come to a Board." I never could comprehend why a Board should necessitate a Board school, and I do not think that that point is generally understood throughout the country. It is surely true that the *raison d'être* of a Board is *not necessarily* to establish a Board school. Of this Oxford has furnished a most valuable illustration. My experience on this point has been gained in a municipal borough, and I have found that where a Town Council, exercising their proper right, have voted to have a Board, even if the Board school is established side by side with a Church or a Nonconformist school, it is not necessary that the Voluntary school should come to an end. I cannot mention this subject in the presence of Mr. Hubbard without bearing testimony to the immense assistance we received from the laity in making a struggle with a Board for the retention of the Church school. What was the result? It was that the Board school was established, side by side with the Church schools, in a rather confined area, although the people were always saying that the whole country was to be covered with Board schools, and that there would be no chance for the Voluntary schools. The Voluntary school, in the case I speak of, my former parish, now flourishes, I believe, in a higher degree than that Board school. The Church is, therefore, essentially strong if you look at the treatment received by her from the State with regard to Voluntary and Board schools. I am not going to allude to what appears to my mind a certain amount of injustice on the part of the State in the treatment of voluntary agencies. My own opinion is distinctly in favour of those schemes of educational subsidy from the State, out of that money which we pay in taxes, and which is really our own, in the best and noblest of all causes. I think the times are hopeful. I think the mere fact that to-day, in a great Church Congress, three laymen, two out of the three having been members of School Boards, one of them being well-known as the invaluable chairman of the Reading School Board, should have read papers here, the first being addressed to us on the side of the preservation of voluntary Church schools by the member for the City of London, is a hopeful sign. It is a witness which we wanted—a witness of the strength which God has given to the laity of the Church of England to defend the rights of the Church, and not to allow, in or out of Parliament, glaring injustice to be perpetrated in the name of justice or of religious liberty. I want to make a very practical appeal to the managers of schools and to those ladies who are present, as forming an essential element in Church education. I appeal to them not to despair, and to see whether besides taking the most favourable view of Government action, they cannot counteract its secularising influence in detail. For instance, why do not managers go more into our Voluntary schools day by day? Why is it that parishioners, when we appeal to them to make occasional visits of inspection, and to say something to the teachers by way of encouraging them in their work, so seldom make any practical response? Again, I do not think we managers can be too careful or too prayerful in the choice of teachers. Nothing can be more essential in examining into the character and antecedents of candidates for the post of teachers, than to find out not only that they are earnest and capable, but that they are *sound in the faith*. We can do very little unless we have the teachers on our side. I have found, in the place I live in, that we have this year, under the New Code, got a very large increase of Government grants; indeed, they are beyond anything we have had before; and I find that her Majesty's Inspector is most earnest to give us every encouragement he can, and that the attendance officer, a Nonconformist, has worked heartily with us, not because of anything in us, but because the principal teacher in the schools, being a strong Churchman himself, is wise and Christian enough to be a liberal Churchman also, and they have pulled together in one boat. In conclusion let me remind you, that "nothing succeeds like success." Instead of being down-hearted, let us endeavour to make our schools the most successful in the country, and then we shall have the people with us. There is a great shaking of opinion in the country. All this agnosticism and unbelief is shaking men up, and there is a strong and healthy movement on the subject of education. It is a struggle for life, and I do believe we ought to go down on our knees and ask for strength to keep the Board schools out, because there is no basis of definite Christianity in a school which is subject to the voice of those who are elected by a mixed body of ratepayers.

H. C. Richards, Esq., Barrister-at-Law, M.L.S.B. for the City of London.

I desire to lay a few practical suggestions before the Congress, as the result of my experience with the London School Board, where I have the honour (though the youngest male member) of representing the same constituency which Mr. Hubbard does in Parliament, and which Canon Gregory represented at the same board. Into the faults and failings of the London School Board I will not enter, time would forbid, and that is a question more for my constituents. We cannot get rid of the Education Act or the School Boards, we have to face the circumstances of the case as they are, and make the best of them for the Church and for religious education. Allusion has been made to the promises of the Prime Minister in 1870, and his refusal to carry them out in 1883. That is nothing new in the political world. It required a change of Government in 1874 to repeal some of the powers of the Endowed School Commissioners, and it may require another turn of the political wheel to secure a fair share of the Imperial Grant for our Voluntary schools. Let it be made a test question to both parties, when soliciting our suffrages at the next General Election, which cannot be far distant. Now for practical action, one thing which pains me more than another, is to see in our weekly agenda the name of clergymen dropping off our roll of school managers, on account of six months' non-attendance. I do not so much blame them, for I know the numerous and high calls upon their time and duties, but I would urge upon them, instead of going on to committees which it is hardly possible they can attend, to nominate instead one or two laymen in whom they have confidence, and who will willingly take up an educational matter; and thus secure a due representation in the Management Board, to whom is still entrusted the important duty of selection of teachers. There is also another field of usefulness open to church schools, and that is to provide for the children of the superior artisans, clerks, and small traders who have an inkling of a more genteel school than the Board. These children, or the brightest of them, will, in the next generation, be in the vanguard of their class, or in the one above it, and if we can but enlist their sympathies with the Church, we have a strong army on our side against those who would poison the minds of the working classes against her. That there is such a view none who have studied the educational demands of the metropolis can deny, and in Liverpool I know of a school which, with a 4d. and a 6d. fee, and the Government Grant, is, practically, self-supporting. It is evident that other people besides peers live up in a balloon, and because I desire that a practical tone should be given to this discussion, I have asked to be allowed to throw out these suggestions—higher paid schools for the children of the lower middle class, in connection with our parochial system, and the careful nomination of lay members of the local committees, to guard the interest of the Church in the Board schools.

The Rev. C. J. Thompson, Vicar of Cardiff.

I venture to express a hope that, under all circumstances, we shall keep this great question lifted up far above the level of political party. My own feeling is that we have as much and as little to hope for from one party as the other. It seems to me that the time has come when the voice of the Church should be distinctly spoken forth on this question. The time has come to act. We have had a great many debates, and our minds are made up in regard to it on one side or the other. It is admitted by all interested in Church education that the Voluntary schools are being hard pressed. I think we are all equally sure that, in the time to come, they are likely to be harder pressed than they are at present. The limit of endurance on the part of Voluntary school managers has almost been reached. What then? Are we prepared to see our Voluntary schools destroyed, to see them pass away from us, and from the heritage of the Church of England and the country, by a kind of painless or painful extinction? If they are destroyed, the Church will receive a deadly blow, because it will be a blow struck at her very heart. If we lose our Voluntary schools, the Church of England will become a kind of religious sect, tolerated by a cynical society and by her enemies, but she will lose the hold on the national conscience and the national life, and she will never be the Church of England any more. We cannot shut our eyes to the fact that there are very ominous signs of

great danger and peril before our Church schools. We must not forget, although none would deny bonds of brotherhood to all, that there is a vigorous, compact, and united party which will never rest until its efforts to destroy our Voluntary schools are successful, or until it has been hurled back in disaster and defeat. You find that party always active and always at work. In Parliament it has a voice, it is a power even in the counsels of the Cabinet, and it is determined to carry out its aims. What is the cry frequently raised when the people are to be stirred with rancorous enthusiasm against the Church? "Free schools" are held out as a bait. We know what that means. It means the destruction of our Voluntary schools. Abolish school fees and we cannot hope, by any possible means, to keep our Voluntary schools open for the education of the children of the country. The work of piecemeal destruction is being actively carried on with regard to our schools, as well as to the Church. It is part of that idea which finds its expression in the Burials Bill and the Marriage Laws Bill. The idea is to make the work of the clergy so difficult, their position so disagreeable, by fining them so heavily and putting such a penalty upon their work, that they will hand it all over because it is impossible to carry it on. I feel pretty confident that not the youngest amongst us will live to see a measure for the Disestablishment of the Church, or the destruction of Voluntary schools brought in *en bloc*, but I am quite sure that endeavours will be made continually to sap and undermine both institutions. Take the matter of rating for premises. The Board school does not care at all about being rated. The Board is able to dip its hands into the pockets of the ratepayers, and it is therefore insensible to the cost. I am told there is a struggling Church school in this town which is assessed at £204, for the privilege of having a place of that kind open for the benefit of the children of the town. That is the policy of those who are opposed to Church education and Voluntary schools. I think we should agitate to get rid of the rating of all school buildings. It seems to me that we have a very fair prospect of success in that kind of agitation. I am not sanguine of success as to some of the schemes that have been proposed this afternoon. But supposing it to be impossible for a church school manager to work his schools, and carry them on. What is he to do? Is he to hand them over to a School Board. He may be compelled to close them, but—and I am speaking as the manager and treasurer of nine large Voluntary school departments, maintained in the face of a powerful School Board—I say never surrender our buildings. We are told that the Church has no actual right to her buildings, because the State, in some instances, gave a certain amount of money towards the building fund. I say that the State, in this matter, occupies exactly the same position as a subscriber, and has no more right to the school property than those who have their names on our subscription lists. The Church has an indefeasible right to the buildings which have cost her so much, and which she holds so dear. I would rather part with the tithes of my benefice than with the ownership of buildings which have come to me as a sacred and a holy trust. It is time we spoke out upon this matter. We know that 700 schools belonging to the Church, and intended for the holy purpose of her children's education, have already slipped out of her hands. It is time to act together, decidedly, and as one body, and say that come what may we will not part, because we cannot part with the ownership of our schools. If we speak out in this way, and if we cast all questions of expediency on one side, I believe we shall be able to retain our schools, for a voice would be heard in the country which would send dismay through the ranks of our foes, which would be listened to with respect in Parliament, and which would have the effect of enabling us to maintain our schools and to keep our buildings; and with them the promise and potency of a work for God and man which can never die.

The Rev. CANON BOWLBY, St. Philip's, Birmingham.

I AGREE with much that has been said by previous speakers with regard to the extreme peril in which the Voluntary schools are placed, but I should be very sorry to adopt the language of despair. I would rather raise the cry "*Nil desperandum.*" Coming as I do from a large town, where church education lies under peculiar disadvantages, I venture to say that even in that town I see no reason for despair. There can be no doubt of the peril being exceedingly great. It lies in several directions, in the competition of School Boards, in the smaller fees or the no fees which they charge, and in the practice which prevails in some places of selecting sites too

near the existing schools. It arises also, as Canon Gregory said, from the existence of a small but active propaganda in this country, who wish to destroy our Voluntary schools, and even the present system of payment of fees in Board schools, and to establish in their place an universal system of free and secular schools. Not long ago I listened to some observations from a Cabinet minister, a member of the present Government, on an occasion when the Vice-President of the Council, Mr. Mundella, to whose fairness I wish to pay my tribute, spoke of our Voluntary schools and Board schools. The Cabinet minister of whom I am speaking, said that the churchmen must look to it, if they attempted to disturb the compromise effected in 1870. They must look to it, that there was not a struggle made in another direction, namely, to deprive all schools of any share in the Government grant, unless they consented to be placed under the control of some representative body, selected by the ratepayers. That shows the existence of a danger to which we must not blind our eyes. But, on the other side, we need not despair, because even in the large town of Birmingham, with which I am connected, no Church school has up to the present time been closed since the passing of the Education Act. It is true that one school has been transferred to the Board, but the liberty of giving religious instruction during the first hour of the day has been reserved. I am not sure whether the Board would make the same bargain again. I am glad to say that nine large schools, containing an average attendance of 4,200 children, which were in imminent peril of being closed, have been saved by the assistance given out of a small fund raised by the churchmen of the town. The grants from this fund, though small, had the effect of cheering the managers and of enabling them to tide over a critical time. But I consider these nine schools to be even now in great peril, and, though for the last thirteen years we have been able to falsify the predictions of our opponents, that not a single Church school would be able to remain open, there is a very considerable danger still to contend against. The strongest among our schools will always stand, because they have a sufficiently large income derived from school fees and Government grant to enable them to be independent of voluntary contributions; but there are certain weaker schools, in less advantageous situations, which find it difficult to stand at all. I am thankful for the words which fell from the Vice-Chairman of the London School Board and the Chairman of the Reading School Board. To me the very hearing of such speeches from chairmen or members of School Boards seems almost like a dream that I had scarcely ever hoped to realise. It is well for those of us who are little accustomed to hear such sentiments from members of School Boards to get away from our ordinary surroundings and to be refreshed, as we have been to-day, by the sound tone of the assurances which we have heard. It is well for us to listen to the words of determination on all sides to claim a just share of the assistance afforded by Parliament, and a just liberty for religious teaching. It is refreshing to listen to these things, and to be able to go back to our labour, encouraged to persevere in the work we have been doing for the last thirteen years in Birmingham, in maintaining our Voluntary schools intact as long as we possibly can.

The Rev. W. M. Lane, Vicar of Normanton.

I should not at this time have trespassed on the time of the Congress but that last night I received a letter from an Education Act Amendment Union which has already been formed. As a member of the School Board, which does not allow religious instruction to be given, and as the manager of several national schools in a poor parish, I should like to say much, but as time is so short I intend to mention just this one fact. Several years ago, a suggestion was brought before diocesan conferences that we ought to make some such representation to Parliament as that which I now hold in my hand, and that it should be sent through the country and largely signed. It is a petition to give a right to churchmen to nominate part of their rate towards the schools which they prefer, or in some way to help Church and denominational schools. I have looked for years for some active body that would take up this matter, and I now find this union has been formed, and that it is approved by the Archbishops of Canterbury and York, the Bishop of Lincoln, and others. People may either form similar unions themselves, or may sign this petition, which is in the following terms:—"1.—That the Education Act of 1870, after being twelve years in operation, has proved unequal in its application: and

instead of completing the Voluntary system, as originally intended, is practically an instrument of attack upon Voluntary schools and religious teaching which are thereby placed under pecuniary disadvantages. 2.—That Board schools, having the entire and exclusive benefit of the Education rate, have already absorbed numbers of Voluntary schools; and such continued absorbing constitutes a peril to Christianity in this country. 3.—That your Petitioners would suggest the appointment of a Royal Commision to institute an inquiry into the working of the Education Act of 1870; especially as affecting the well-being of the voluntary system, the interests of rate-payers with regard to the present increasing and unlimited Education rate, and the danger of instruction without moral or religious training. 4.—That, whilst not desiring to anticipate the decisions and recommendations of any Commission, the remedies for the pecuniary disadvantages under which Voluntary schools are struggling to live alongside Board schools, may possibly be found either in the increasing of the Government grant to the extent of making efficient Voluntary schools aided by school fees entirely independent of voluntary contributions; or, by a general education rate (taxing Income-tax returns as well as visible property) with proportionate participation by all schools formed under the conditions of the Statute. Your Petitioners, therefore, pray your Right Honourable House to take such steps as may seem to your wisdom best to prevent further injury to Religious Education." It will, I think, be one good result of our meeting to-day if this petition is largely signed. The present head-quarters of the Union are at Bedale, in Yorkshire, and the Hon.-secretary is Mr. R. Pest, of that place. There is one other matter I would refer to, and that is with regard to the School Board rate. It seems to be excessively unfair that it should be collected on the basis of the poor-rate, and not on the basis of the district-rate. It is unfair to the farmers. I have an evidence of this in my own parish, where we are all poor people. A poor farmer, who for some years, has been struggling to surport himself, but getting no income at all, has during the last seven years been called upon to pay something like £20 to £30 a year towards supporting the education of the children of engine-drivers or miners, who are getting wages much larger than his income. We certainly want to agitate. This is a proper matter to agitate about, and it would make an immense difference if the rate were collected on the basis of the district rate. That surely would be a fair arrangement, and we have a right to demand it.

The Rev. H. R. Baker, Vicar of St. Michael's, Woolwich.

I wish to suggest a remedy with regard to the difficulties of the Voluntary schools. Let us have a system of allotment of rates such as I believe prevails in Canada, and let churchmen be rated for their own schools, nonconformists for theirs, and secularists for theirs. We all believe that education without religion is of no value whatever, and I take it then that this is a matter of conscience. It has pressed on my conscience for many years that I have to pay for the support of schools which are giving education that is valueless, because no definite religious teaching is combined with it. I believe we have this matter absolutely in our own hands. You remember what the nonconformists did when they wished to abolish Church rates. They refused to pay those rates, and very shortly afterwards the rates were abolished. If we are all in earnest about this thing we can very soon save our schools. Are you going to allow your schools to be put an end to by degrees in the way indicated by many speakers, when it rests with you to save them, and you can do so? Refuse to pay the rates unless they are allotted to your own schools. Have the courage of your opinions, if you really believe there can be no true education without definite religious training. I do not suppose that one, or two, or three here and there will do it; but if the managers of fifty of our schools would only come forward and say they would not support Board schools, which are practically bringing up a set of atheists in the country, the battle would be won.

The Ven. John Lionel Darby, Archdeacon of Chester.

I cannot altogether agree with the advice that has just been given to us. I think we should win our battle by simpler methods than that of refusing to pay a tax which the Government of England and the House of Commons have sanctioned.

But I do wish earnestly to ask my brother churchmen to say with a united voice, and with perfect clearness that the concessions of the Church have reached their last limit. I do not think the State can, with any pretence of fairness and justice, interfere more than it does at present with our educational system. I have to ask you to consider that if you allow your Voluntary schools to become extinct, in three years after that is done religious education will have become extinct in Board schools also. Without the competition of Church schools, the religious education now given in Board schools would cease, and I think that would be a great evil, although I do not attach much value to the kind of religious instruction given in Board schools now. Remember that while it can be said with truth that the Apostle's Creed may be taught in some Board schools, it depends from year to year on the vote of the Board. To emphasise the danger which is before us let me tell you what happened in Suffolk. It was agreed by a majority of one on the Board one year that the Bible should be taught, and a number of bibles were accordingly bought. On the election of a new Board, however, the majority went by one in another direction, and the teaching of the Bible ceased. Remember now that there are ninety-six Boards in England who have made no provision whatever for the teaching of the Apostle's Creed in their schools; let me re-echo the warning words uttered by Canon King, in the Congress Hall, in reference to our Universities, namely, that the great danger immediately before our people is that of being educated in creedless schools. It is no less true of those educated in elementary schools than it is of those who go to the Universities. In conclusion, let me remind you of the old saying, that late sowing produces a bad harvest. I ask all managers of Church schools, whether they be laymen or clerics, not to think that without previous training all can be done by the training colleges for our Church schoolmasters. Two years is all too short for the great pressure put upon the students in our training colleges. I do not mean to cast the faintest reflection on the work done in the colleges; I bear the most willing testimony to the hard and excellent work done in them in the way of religious teaching; but I say that that work must be based upon previous religious training. May I make an appeal to you? Wherever there are Board schools, I do entreat the clergy of the Church of England to look after the pupil teachers in them, and I know of my own personal knowledge that, at any rate, some of the pupil teachers in those schools are not only ready and willing to receive instruction at the hands of their own clergymen, but that they are eagerly looking for it. In God's name, I venture to say, do not let these young girls and boys be disappointed in this hope.

The Rev. HENRY ROE, Rector of Poyntington, Somerset.

TWENTY-FOUR years ago, on a very hot day, from the beach at Swanage, I climbed up a steep chalk hill; when I came to the top I saw a wooden seat, and underneath it were carved the words, "Rest and be thankful." As I sat there and looked over the pretty valley on the other side of the hill, I took the advice volunteered to me by the seat, and did rest, and was thankful. Now, I think that is a little bit of a parable suitable for the present occasion. We have gone on so far, and the Church has been on the hill top for the last forty years. We have got on so far; there is the seat; should we not rest and be thankful, or should we go down the hill again? In other words, should we bring in a bill and allow our enemies to write all the clauses. If we agitate for an increase of the grant, it means carrying the grant up to twenty shillings, and we must have an Act of Parliament to do this. Are we ready to toss a bill down into the area of the House of Commons, and to let the House of Commons write what they please on that bill? Depend upon it, it is much wiser to rest and be thankful. We are losing our schools to the School Boards, and we are told that if we go on as we are doing we shall soon be extinct. Well, what is the rate at which we are losing these schools? It is at such a rate that it will be 300 years before the work will be complete, and many things will happen between now and then. We are told we have to pay the very large sum of £600,000 a year in voluntary subscriptions, and Canon Gregory said it was a fine for teaching religion. For my own part, I would rather call it our own free sacrifice, which we cheerfully make for doing our duty, and if we withdraw it we are simply turning our backs on what we as English churchmen are bound to do. I took the trouble a few days ago of writing to the Secretary of the Jewish Board of Guardians, and I got to know this. The Jews' religious scruples forbid them to allow the poor

of their religion to go into the workhouse, or to receive relief from the parish rates. What, then, *is* done? Like brave men, and men who believe in their opinions, they put their hands into their pockets, they elect a Board of Guardians of their own to work the whole matter entirely, and in addition they pay their parish rates without a murmur as part of their duty to the State. That is precisely our case. You and I do not consent to let our children go to the Board school. What is the sacrifice we have to make in consequence? £600,000 a year, and that amount is going down. It has decreased by many thousands every year for the last five years. If the Board paid all, what right should we have to demand distinctive teaching in the Church schools? None at all. Let me ask those who have come from the country to recollect that this difficulty does not occur much in country parishes. We mean to do better under the new code than the old one, and the consequence will be that we shall not need this additional grant. Then, I would say, let the town schools improve their attendance. I have some figures here that cannot be assailed. The London Church schools at this moment only fill some 72 per cent. of their accommodation. What would be the result if the remaining 28 were filled, and there is no reason why it should not be. The result would be to increase the grant by five shillings more per head on the present average attendance, and only four shillings more would be required to make the schools independent of voluntary contributions. Why should not the London parishes combine together and have one common fund; then the 9d. schools, which are carried on at a profit, could help the 2d. schools?

Major Fergusson, of the Rifle Brigade, Aldershot.

I TRUST I shall be acquitted of presumption in taking part in this discussion when I say that I have been working for two or three years in a distant part of the empire in the cause of religious education. Some years ago I was on the staff in Australia, and returning there in a military appointment about three years ago, I was at once struck by the altered demeanour of the young people. I will not go into particulars, but I may say that the Commissioner of Police more than confirmed my worst fears. I asked myself, what is the cause of this terrible change? Seven years before the Government had taken over all the schools, and had, practically, closed all the Voluntary schools. In doing so they had banished religion from the schools. I speak more particularly of South Australia; but the same thing had been done two years before in Victoria. At the Church of England Synod I brought forward the subject, and we formed a strong society. In spite of the opinions of the Ministry of the day, who were strong secularists, we took a poll of the parents, and by nine to one they voted for Bible reading and teaching during school hours. The movement spread to Victoria, where the bishop headed it, and the new Bishop of Adelaide is now working hard in the same cause. With regard to the position of the English schools, I am sure that the Archbishop of Canterbury spoke words of wisdom at the annual meeting of the National Society, when he said, "rest and be thankful." You do labour under a great hardship, and you might justly ask for a great alteration of the system, but it would not be politic to do so. If the question of education came once more before Parliament the position of Church schools would be greatly altered for the worse. I have the highest authority of the Church for that statement, and I do earnestly trust that the clergy and the Church generally, will work in patience under the hardships which they have to bear, and will hold fast that which they have that no man take their crown.

The Rev. C. D. Goldie, St. Ives, Huntingdon.

I DO not like to be thankful for nothing, and it seems to me that as it is we shall be thankful if we are thankful at all, for a very great injustice. I therefore hope that the National Society, or some other society, will work to form a nucleus of members of Parliament, and will gather together from every part of England facts that will prove clearly enough the injustice under which we labour. But it is not only in Acts of Parliament, or with the Education Department that we are to interfere. I believe that Mr. Mundella is anxious to do justice to us, and that the

tone of the last debate was satisfactory to clergymen. But I want to know if there is not a propaganda of another sort against Voluntary schools. I think that the Government Inspectors do not treat the Voluntary schools fairly when there is a struggle between the Board school and the Voluntary school. I am certain they have given their whole weight to diminish the grant of the Voluntary school and to increase that of the Board school. I cannot help suspecting that there must be a *mot d'ordre* of the Central body on the subject, or this would not be the case. I think we should have a central committee, not only to push forward our cause in Parliament, but to gather information on the action in general, and especially on the action of the Inspectors in estimating the grant, for we are almost entirely in their hands under the new Act.

CONGRESS HALL,

THURSDAY EVENING, OCTOBER 4TH.

The Right Rev. The PRESIDENT in the Chair.

SUNDAY OBSERVANCE.

PAPER.

The Rev. DANIEL MOORE, Prebendary of St. Paul's, and Vicar of Holy Trinity, Paddington.

I AM asked to read a paper on the subject of SUNDAY OBSERVANCE. I presume I shall not misinterpret the intentions of the Committee, in supposing that the subject is to be viewed, both from its theological and from its political side; in other words, that I shall be expected to consider how far the observance spoken of is defined by revealed authority; and next, what is its aspect towards the present condition of social life?

I. The theological aspect of the question raises two main issues: the first is, how far is the Sabbatic institution, considered in its broad sense, as the separation of one day in the week for sacred uses, to be regarded as a dispensational accident, and, therefore, of force only during the continuance of the dispensation to which it belongs? and the second, on the assumption that it is universal and perpetual in its obligation, how far are the conditions of its observance modified by the spirit or precepts of the Christian dispensation?

i. Let me first deal with that branch of the subject which has respect to the proper moral sanctity belonging to the Sabbatic institution itself; the proof, to be derived from Scripture, that in its institution, purpose, and religious significance, the Rest-day—call it Sabbath, or Sunday, or what you will—has an indelible sacredness impressed upon it, which is independent of all dispensational changes, and must be binding upon the religious conscience for all time.

(1) In support of this, we must first look to the history of the institution itself. When, and how did it begin? Was it in Paradise? or was it under the dispensation of the patriarchs? or was it during the

administration of Moses and the prophets? And if the instiution were first set on foot under any one of these divisional landmarks in the religious history of mankind, were the reasons given for setting it on foot, such as were peculiar to the dispensation under which it was given, and consequently of no obligation afterwards? To these questions the words of Moses, in the second chapter of Genesis, seem to supply a sufficient answer. The seventh-day institution was PARADISAICAL in its origin; and the reason assigned for instituting it is one which could have nothing to do with one dispensation more than another:—"And God blessed the seventh day and sanctified it; BECAUSE that in it He had rested from all His work which God created and made."

Tending to the view of a pre-Mosaic Sabbath are several incidental notices, both before and after the Deluge, all conclusive to the fact that the Sabbath is, at all events, *not* of Levitical origin; as well as favouring the belief, both that it was kept in the patriarchal age, and was observed by peoples and nations before the Jewish Church or nation had any existence.

(2) Still more conclusive against any view of the Sabbath which would make the sanctity attaching to it *dispensational or transitory* only, is the solemn injunction for its observance contained in the Ten Commandments. Now, that the decalogue is of dispensational obligation only, is more, we may presume, than any Christian man would be bold enough to affirm. And yet the reference to the Sabbath in the Fourth Commandment, emphasised by the word "Remember," pre-supposes it to be an already established usage, and dating back from the time of Creation. So much seems necessary to observe in refutation of the very common assumption, nowhere more frequently put forth than in the British Parliament, that the Sabbath is a mere festival of the Jewish Church, deriving all its sanctity from the Levitical law. So far otherwise, we hold with our own Hooker, that "the moral law requireth this hallowing of a seventh part of our time throughout the age of the whole world," and that "to account for the sanctification of one day in seven is a duty which God's immutable law doth exact for ever." Of course there will always be differences of opinion as to what the sanctification of a day means, or how much of pleasure or of secular employment may be compatible with the hallowing seal set upon the Sabbath of Paradise. But that "sanctification" means "secularisation," or can even consist with it, will, I think, hardly be maintained; whilst that the fourth, or any commandment of the decalogue, is of temporary obligation—that it has no more force to the Christian conscience than the abstaining from the flesh of animals "that chew the cud or divide the hoof"—at this our Christian common sense revolts. We may leave open some collateral questions; but *a* Sabbath, *a* seventh portion of time, a day of rest consecrated and hallowed to the honour of the most High God—this we must acknowledge to be a statute of heavenly legislation which changeth not. It is the ordinance of God for all time, made neither for Jew, nor Christian, nor Church, nor age. "The Sabbath was made for man."

ii. Assuming, however, the ground to have been made good, that the Sabbath or seventh-day rest is *not* Jewish in its origin, *not* dispensational or mutable in its obligation, but is a world-old enactment, binding on the consciences of all mankind alike, the question has still to be

considered how far the conditions of observance have become modified by the introduction of Christianity.

And here it is to be remembered that we know nothing of any particular authority under which, as a day of sacred observance, the *first* day of the week was made to take the place of the *seventh*. That the one gradually did take the place of the other is an admitted fact; but as is well known, many of the first converts from Judaism were accustomed to keep *both* the days holy. Whilst as to the hard, stilted Sabbatarianism which comes of assimilating the Christian Lord's Day to the abrogated Sabbath of the Jews, it must suffice to say that there is no authority for it whatever, either ecclesiastical or Scriptural. The Fathers are as silent about it as the Gospels, Luther and Calvin are as dead against it as St. Paul.

Sunday observance, then, as conditioned or interpreted by the New Testament, is to be viewed apart from anything national, evanescent, or dispensational; and the day regarded in the light of an institute which is universal and eternal. The institutions of Moses are nothing to us but as they supply analogies of things higher than themselves, patterns of things in the spiritual heavens, but still only the figures of the true. The true archetype Sabbath, going before, over-riding, outliving all covenants, must be the Sabbath of Paradise. Whatever character was stamped upon that, at the beginning, must remain until now. It has the setting of a perpetual ordinance. The seal cannot be "railed from the bond." It is a hallowed thing, a sanctified thing, a GOD-consecrated thing. Who is he that will secularise it, and call it a common thing?

And short of anything which has a tendency towards this, towards removing all the differentiating marks which make our day of rest, "a day holy unto the Lord and honourable," I see no fetters imposed by the New Testament upon the Christian conscience. The keynote of Sunday observance, to the true Christian, is supplied in those words of the Psalmist, "This is the day the Lord hath made, we will rejoice and be glad in it." For is not our Lord's Day the festival of the new creation? the Church's birthday? And shall our songs be less joyous when joining in the loud refrain, "He is risen! He is risen!" than were those of the angels, at the birth of Creation, "when the morning stars sung together, and all the sons of God shouted for joy?"

Neither is there anything, either in the example or teaching of our Lord, which is opposed to this view of a cheerful Sabbath observance. Careful as He was to give no countenance to the gloomy and austere views of the Scribes and Pharisees, yet never did a word fall from His lips in disparagement of the ever-binding sacredness of the institution itself. On the contrary, He kept it, He honoured it, He took every opportunity of sanctifying it, either by teaching in the synagogue and in the temple, or employing Himself in works of mercy to the bodies and souls of men. His Sabbath demeanour, at all times, supplied the best commentary on His own words, "The Sabbath was made for man, and not man for the Sabbath."

II. I now proceed to consider the question of Sunday observance from its political side, or the general aspect of the subject towards the present conditions of social life.

i. And here the first point for consideration is, in what light, as

Christians or as Churchmen are we to regard a proposal, continually brought before Parliament, to sanction the opening of museums and other exhibitions on the Lord's Day? I say "other exhibitions," because, although it is only for the Sunday opening of our great national collections that the sanction of Parliament has yet been asked, no one supposes that the authors of the movement intend to stop there; or that an opening for the wedge once effected, it is not meant to drive it home, till the theatre, the music hall, and the dancing booth are allowed to throw open their doors as regularly as the house of God.

(1) But, whether partial or entire, we demur to such Sunday opening as a measure of the grossest *injustice* between man and man. On the very head and front of the proposal is written the condition, that one man's pleasure is to be another man's toil: that some men are to be eased somewhat, that others may be more burdened. This, in degree, no doubt, must take place, where men allow themselves on the Lord's Day in works of charity or necessity. But candour must allow it would be only in a very inappreciable degree. Not so, if our Sundays should degenerate into the license of a Bank-holiday. Then would the forms of Sunday labour, evoked into activity, mock all reckoning. Even now the name is "legion" of those who have the Sunday slave brand burnt into their flesh—obliged, every Lord's Day morning, to hear from a thousand belfries the mocking chimes, "the day of rest."

In illustration of this, take an example from one department of labour only. Twenty-four thousand men are said to be employed on Sunday in connection with public conveyances. On one Sunday in seven omnibus men are allowed an "off-day;" and, on the others, there is some diminution in the number of journeys performed. But the intervals of rest are too brief to be available for purposes of public worship, even if the men, jaded, and worn, and spirit-broken, had any mind thereto. And, as a consequence, for anything that appears, the men live and die without God, and without hope. I speak that I do know, and testify that I have seen, when I tell how bitterly these men are heard to mourn at the last, that during all the years of their toilsome occupation they had never heard the word of exhortation, and had never entered the house of God. Are we or are we not our brother's keepers? And is this enforced depriving of all soul-food to countless thousands of our fellow-creatures, for our mere pleasure's sake, a righteous thing in the sight of God or man?

(2) Again, we utterly disallow the plea for the opening of public exhibitions on Sundays, that it will tend to draw the working classes from lower and *sensualising gratifications*. A partial experiment of the plan has been in operation for years, in the opening of the Kew Gardens and the Hampton Court Palace; whilst, more recently, the *letter* of the law was found to be not infringed by the opening of the Grosvenor Gallery. Will any of those who have the charge of these exhibitions testify that their Sunday visitors were of the class who would otherwise have been found in the public-houses? My testimonies have misled me greatly if the persons who made use of this Sunday privilege were not of the class who, as far as enforced labour is concerned, could just as easily have gone on any other day of the week.

But besides this, it is a notorious fact that, in the vicinity of public

exhibitions of all kinds, drinking houses cluster more thickly than anywhere else, and generally are the worst conducted. Hence the willingness of Gebal and Ammon—the Sunday League and the publicans—to consort together in this matter. The public exhibitions in London are, for the most part, at a distance from the residences of the working men. By rail or otherwise, they must take a journey to get to them. Is not the tavern-keeper wise in his generation in thinking that, after a long walk or ride, followed by the fatigue of sightseeing, a working man will be likely to indulge his taste for stimulating refreshments. The anticipated diminution of vice and intemperance by means of these Sunday openings, therefore, I cannot but think is a delusion and a snare.

(3) But a stronger ground than any yet mentioned against this Sunday secularisation scheme, is to be found in its certain tendency, eventually, to deprive the poor man of his day of rest altogether.

Far more than any other class of society, this is essentially a WORKING-MAN'S question. The fact, I fear, is but too little realised by our labouring classes, that every step taken in the direction of Sunday desecration, for the purposes of *voluntary pleasure*, is a step in the same direction for purposes of *compulsory work*. Let the principle of a proper sanctity, belonging to the day, be once given up, and the institution be brought down to the level of a respectable Church usage, and an employer may consistently say to his working men—"If your conscience is lax enough to take *pleasure* for your own sake on the Lord's Day, it surely cannot task it much to do a little *work* for mine."

For a time, no doubt, this may be only an exceptional arrangement, and as such, may be attended with increased remuneration. But political economy has its fixed laws. They bend not at the bidding of the humane and considerate man, any more than at that of the man of greed, and grind, and grasp. Let it once be proved that employers may get out of their workmen a whole or even half a day's more labour than they used to do, and the exception will very soon become the rule. From motives of cupidity or competition, a corresponding reduction will gradually take place in the rate of wages, until the labouring man finds he receives no more for working SEVEN days than he formerly did for working SIX.

I am persuaded that many a poor man is spared from compulsory Sunday labour now, because employers dare not, in the face of an almost universal verdict of society in favour of the sacredness of the day, force a workman's conscience. But let society once cancel that verdict; let the workman show, by his presence at this public exhibition or that, that in this matter he has no conscience to force, and the master's shame will soon depart from him; and the workman who refused to keep his day of rest HOLY, will find, as he deserves to find, that he gets no day of rest at all.

I rejoice greatly to see that the working-men of England are beginning to see this: testifying by their numerously signed petitions to Parliament, that they have learned to discriminate who are most to be considered their true friends, those who would open for them the doors of the *museum* on the Lord's Day, with the certain consequence of its leading to the opening of the doors of the *workshop* on that day also; or those who would absolutely and entirely close the doors of BOTH, in

order to secure to man his needed rest, and to God the worship He has commanded for His holy day?

But, in truth, this ought not to be a question of class at all. It is one which concerns rich and poor alike. For to the long-acknowledged, although too-slightly maintained sanctity of our Lord's Day, I believe we are largely indebted for our healthy robustness as a people, for our honour and prestige among the nations of the world, for the purity and soundness of our faith in Christ, and for the signs and tokens everywhere resting upon us, that, as a country, we are the highly-favoured of God. Oh, yes! I believe God honours us because, in the sanctifying of His holy day, we, as a nation, desire to honour Him. For such an observance, apart from its dispensational aspects—its relation to a larger scheme of revealed truth—was to become a pledge of the Divine existence, a standing and eloquent witness to the nations that GOD IS. The impious Voltaire, who was at least wise in his generation, saw plainly the importance of this aspect of the question. And therefore we find him writing to Diderot, "No hope is there for the triumph of our principles whilst every seventh day we see people going in crowds to a place to worship God." And if this witness were extorted from him by what he saw of a Sunday in France, where there is nothing in furnace or factory, in the traffic of the town, or in the labour of the field, to distinguish the Sunday from other days of the week, with how much greater force would it apply to the comparative quietude of our English Lord's Day? No doubt our Continental neighbours may throw out—we know they do throw out—the taunt against our English Sundays of tristeness, and melancholy, and gloom; but hardly can they look upon the glad multitude as they throng to the house of God; the closed shop and warehouse announcing that the inmates are enjoying their privileged and protected rest; the well-dressed artisan and his family meditating in the fields at eventide; and the great city, with its silence unbroken by the sound of axe or hammer—hardly can their eyes rest upon such a scene as this, without the thought forcing itself upon them—"Happy are the people that are in such a case; yea, blessed are the people who have the Lord for their God."

ADDRESSES.

The Very Rev. A. P. PUREY-CUST, Dean of York.

WHAT am I to add, in fifteen minutes, on a subject which has already been thoroughly threshed out, and on which all that can be said on every side has been said much better than I can say it, and at greater length than is possible in the time at my disposal? I can only hope to remind you, as concisely as possible, of a simple principle which seems in danger of being overlooked by the contending parties, and which may perhaps affect the tone of (though it will add nothing new to) the lines of action. "The Sabbath was made for man." That very statement of the *God-man* may guide us to the reason why there are so many differences as to the observance of it—for man is a being of a duplex, if not complex, nature, with interests, and occupations, and duties for time, and aspirations for eternity; with animal appetites and passions,

which he is to control, but which he cannot, and ought not to, extinguish, and which need to be rested and reinvigorated, and with spiritual powers which require to be refreshed and stimulated. Neither part of his being can be ignored, neither dispensed with. The problem of life is to reconcile them to maintain his whole spirit, soul, and body, so that its inherent parts shall not be antagonistic to, but in harmony with, and helpful to, each other.

And if "the Sabbath was made for man" as he is, by God, who knows what is in man, and who is ever graciously ordering all things to supply his needs, it was meant to supply all these wants. What wonder if man individually, what wonder if man collectively, fails, through the inherent infirmity of his nature, always, or perhaps ever, to comprehend and to act on this.

"The Sabbath was made for man," says the human animal, as, wearied with work and labour, he longs for the time when he can find some relaxation for his tired limbs and throbbing brain; some day of rest which he can call his own, during which he can lay aside the instruments of his calling, escape from the sights and scenes of business, and exchange the close atmosphere of the factory, shop, or office for the fresh air of heaven, or, at any rate, for a short season amidst surroundings which shall make him forget the grinding toil for the meat which perisheth, for something which shall soothe, and brighten, and refresh existence, restore vigour to his limbs, and elasticity to his brain, and send him, as a new man, to grapple with the requirements of life again. "The Sabbath was made for man," and he is tempted to regard as the very enemy of humanity those who would seem to deprive him of what his very nature seems to require, and his God to have provided for him.

"The Sabbath was made for man" says, on the other hand, the spiritual human being. Life is quickly passing away with him. He feels he is a stranger and sojourner upon earth, and the great eternity beyond, with its open door ever at hand through which he must pass some day, and may pass any day. Even while he tarries here, he is conscious of many anxieties, cares, and temptations which he can only deal with by the power of the grace of God, and upon which his happiness, not to say his safety, on this side of the grave hinges. He feels that his daily life is disqualifying him for this—deadening his aspirations, weakening his hands, making him a slave where he should be free, a victim where he should be a conqueror. What must his life become to him if he has not frequent periods to deal calmly with these things, to seek for that without which prosperity must be a dissatisfaction and a snare, and adversity overwhelming? Who can maintain pure affections, calm temperament, resolute purposes, and heavenly aspirations, if every thought, and every power, and every energy is to be devoted to that on which is written "passing away?" Terrible destiny, to be always compelled to grapple with things seen and temporal, and to have no time, no energy, no appetite for things unseen and eternal. "The Sabbath was made for man"—not for Jews, but appointed for man by God when He created man, and ratified to man by Jesus Christ when He redeemed man. And those who would rob man of that which is so truly his, and so essential to his welfare, he feels, are to be regarded as the foes of the human race, if not the very enemies of God Himself.

So the two classes of men, or, to speak more accurately, the two natures which exist in man, speak, and there are truths on either side—the problem is to reconcile them. And perhaps the contrast between them is brought very prominently before us because here, in England, we are situated between nations whose tendency is to press either view to its extreme. Our northern neighbours in Scotland, on the one hand, have succeeded in enforcing the latter until it has become, to too many, a weariness to the flesh. From their very zeal to promote what

they feel to be the Divine Will, and essential for the spiritual interests of human nature, they have striven to suppress everything which may appeal to or gratify the lower animal interests or cravings of man. Everything which interferes, or might interfere, with spirituality of thought is tabooed. Even the most innocent recreations are interdicted. The sound of instrumental music has been hushed, until latety, in their churches. A whistle is a profanation, and the preparation of daily food is almost or entirely suspended. I am not a Scotchman or a Scotchman's son, and therefore any remarks of mine might be deemed to be imbued with Anglican ignorance and prejudice, but Dr. Guthrie will, at least, be accepted as a well-informed and unprejudiced witness, and, in the introduction to his "Sundays Abroad," he first draws for us an illustration of his ideal Sunday, what he terms "an honest and candid picture of the manner in which the Lord's-day was observed," he says, "in the home of my youth. A day passed in the calm, soothing, elevating atmosphere of religious privileges, amidst the social intercourse of a home animated by spiritual tone and interest, much the same," he says, "as the Lord's-day was observed by the late Bishop Blomfield, at Fulham Palace, and as regards which" (I agree with him), "that he can 'set up no higher standard.'" And then he criticises, in a severe, though not unfriendly, spirit, what he deems the mistakes of his countrymen in this respect. "A devout observance of this day," he says, "has been hindered rather than helped by the extremely rigid and gloomy views which some good people have entertained regarding the proper way of observing the fourth commandment. Nor can I deny that my countrymen once, and, to some extent, a portion of them still, have thereby furnished occasions for attack, ridicule, and ribaldry to the enemies of religion. The conduct of some who advocate the cause of the Sabbath," he says, "admits neither of apology or defence. Animated less by principle than by prejudice and passion, they have injured the cause which they professed to serve. And men have concluded, and with justice, that their bitterness, narrow-mindedness, and malignity were breaches of the law of God more flagrant than the errors, if errors they were, which they condemned." While, to illustrate the extreme to which the practice was pushed, even by the best of men, he tells us how, staying with Dr. Chalmers, he said to his host, as he retired to his bedroom on Saturday night, "I may ring for hot water in the morning." On this he instantly raised his hands, saying, "Hush, hush." Astonished and taken quite aback, and fancying, from his deprecatory manner and look that he had greatly misunderstood his question, he repeated it; but this only called forth more startling and emphatic warning, followed by this explanation, *sotto voce*, "Speak of shaving on the Lord's-day, and you need never more preach in ——shire."

On the other hand, our neighbours in the South seem in danger of sinking altogether the spiritual in the claims of the animal. Religious duties, very often of the briefest character, even when practised at all, are soon disposed of, almost ere the dawn of the first day in the week has passed. Thence all thought of higher and more spiritual subjects are, for the most part, set aside. Ease, pleasure, recreation, self-indulgence, in one form or another, occupy the day, and the sound of mirth and merrymaking resounds on all sides. Very harmless, no doubt, oftentimes, and oftentimes free from those excesses which defile our own nation on this day, and our northern neighbours, too. And I dare say that there may be some few who manage to maintain that relative observance of religious and social duties on the Lord's-day, which may render it a refreshment for body, soul, and spirit. But with the mass of people it is not so. One side, and one side only, of man's nature is really attended to. The period of the day allotted for spiritual purposes may be sufficient to discharge a religious duty, but scarcely enough to give any spiritual rest and refreshment. And the remainder of the

day is devoted to enjoyments, which certainly only appeal to the lower, or at least the perishable, part of man's nature. And this is surely not an equitable treatment of the duplex or complex being which, we must admit, man to be. But in proportion as the day thus ceases to be a day of rest, and becomes a day of enjoyment, it must become a day of work for others, and hence it comes to pass that the continental Sunday is by far the hardest day of work in the week to many. "Go and see the bull-fight last Sunday?" said a flyman to me at Havre, some years ago, when, under the late empire, some attempt was made to introduce that disgusting exhibition into France. "What time have I to go to bull-fights on Sunday, when I am working hard all day?" And when one contemplates the ubiquitous pleasure-making which meets the eye in a continental city, and which some of our compatriots would fain see in England, one is apt to say, Some one must work to promote all this. And one is not altogether surprised to see that if men have thus to work to promote the pleasures of others, they will work also to promote their own profit. And so, in the south of France at least, the vines are cultivated and the orange trees trimmed, and houses built and repaired, and work seems to me to go on much the same on that day as on any other.

Well, we look first on this picture and then on that, and neither altogether pleases us. And as the influence, now of the one and now of the other, seems likely to be getting into the ascendant, we shrink from it, for we see the blemishes in each, but not perhaps how to reconcile the truths, or rather the portions of one and the same great truths, which seem to me to lie on both sides.

On the one hand, our northern neighbours appear to provide for the one part of human nature without an adequate recognition of the other. Where the spiritual appetite really exists (and happy, thrice happy, they to whom these words apply), what more delightful, what more refreshing, what more edifying, than a day in which all consideration for things of time and sense are lost in the contemplation and cultivation of the things unseen? What wonder if those who do appreciate this, guard it as a heritage for themselves and children, which is not to be tampered with. On the other hand, where such an appetite does not exist, or where it is artificially maintained, and a *regimé* is required to be submitted to, not willingly, but as a stern necessity, what wonder if it cause many to form hard views of God, and to regard Him as one who is requiring of them a service which they cannot render, and lading them with a bondage grievous to be borne. I pity from my very heart the human being passing through life, as all find life to be, chequered, troubled, and transitory, who finds Sunday a day of *ennui;* but, nevertheless, to force religious observances on such people, or to hamper them with fetters which cannot be distinctly proved to be God's forging for "man," is simply to cast pearls before swine, and to ignore the responsibility, as well as the privilege, of human freewill.

And while I quite sympathise with those whose homes are poor and squalid, cramped spaces in vitiated atmosphere, and with those solitary beings, often young men and women, whose lowly lodging can scarcely be called home, still I think that a remedy for this may be purchased at a price which it would be unwise, if not unlawful, to pay, and which might, and I believe would, prove no effectual remedy at all.

As regards the working classes, they have, I think, reason to say, "Save me from my friends." If I can judge from the utterances of those who know them best, they have no wish, as a body, to see the present restrictions relaxed. They feel that in them they have the protection which the weak need against the strong. That more pleasure means more work, though not necessarily increased wages. That if the thin edge of the wedge be thrust in, it will, eventually, be driven home. That the same

logical result which some of us see in handling the marriage question, equally belongs to the Sunday question. And that as to the opening of museums and galleries closing public-houses, that, whatever other advantages it might have, may be relegated to the region of moonshine. There is the spiritual, as well as the animal, element active in the working classes; and whether the one or the other is uppermost in them, they want to be free to exercise it, and certainly not, for the sake of specious liberty, to entail upon themselves and their fellows a more galling and grinding restraint. I think that if you asked them, the majority would say that there was already too much Sunday work, and that they find, even with extra wages, it does not pay. They do not want you and me to dictate to them where and how to spend their Sabbath, but they do ask us to stand by them and preserve it to them—one and all.

Have I any remedies to suggest? Plenty; but not in the two minutes which remain. My remedies are not, however, Law, Acts of Parliament, or Police. I do not believe very much in such resources, which simply enable great subjects to be made catspaws for selfish and aspiring politicians, and lead to very scant results. Besides, this is not a meeting of Quarter Sessions, or a Social Science Congress, but a Church Congress, where such a treatment of the subject would be out of place, and I have much more confidence in those means which are legitimately within our own sphere. I should have liked to have said a few words, had I had time, on the relief, at any rate, which might be obtained by remembering that the Sabbath is "the evening and the morning," as well as the morning and the evening, and by some observing the one and some the other. But I have only time for one single consideration.

"The Sabbath was made for man." Not for an aggregate of selfish, isolated units, each of which is to think only of himself, but for members of a great body corporate, which are to have the same care one for another, and of which if one member suffer all the members suffer with it. For men who have not the same spiritual capacities and aspirations—some bringing forth thirty, some sixty, and some a hundredfold, but yet who, in the estimation of the Son of Man, are all "good ground." For man, who is always bound to ask this further question, even if conscientiously convinced that anything is good and lawful for himself, "How does this affect my fellow-*man?*" If the Saviour has laid down no arbitrary restrictions on the observance of Sunday, how can we? But we can and we ought to remember that if we "profess and call ourselves Christians," we are the disciples of Him who, by the example of self-sacrifice and loving obedience to what He felt to be the Divine Will, drew all men to Himself, and has bid us follow the blessed steps of His most holy life. And men will be more likely to attend to what we feel to be means of grace, and to adopt habits which commend themselves to us, if we show that we take pleasure therein, and would fain have them share it, than if we strive to force them to do so, and bitterly reproach those who do not. Frequent services, short services, musical services, plain services, children's services, services with long sermons, services with short sermons, services without sermons, and sermons without services. Classes, meetings, lectures—illustrated or not. The retirement, the occupations, the society of home (in the many cases where they do exist), not disregarded. Social intercourse between members of families and friends, in which religion is neither enforced nor tabooed. The threshold of religion made inviting, not repulsive, and those who perhaps halt at the threshold, not reviled and driven away. Appetites of all sorts provided for. Milk for babes, and strong meat for those of full age. And no mutual recriminations. Our own enjoyment, genuine, unmistakeable. Our lives proving, in aim, tone, and temper, that we have chosen the more excellent way, and therefore likely to make others, not only almost, but altogether, such as we are.

On the other hand, the Sabbath was made for man. And you, who most loudly

claim the indulgence needed, you say, for your own humanity, are bound, if you would be truly manly, to consider others also. There is much to be said for artisans, or clerks, or professional men, with their wives and families, on the tram-car; but what reasonable excuse can be pleaded for Dives and his friends, male and female, on his four-horse drag, lawn tennis parties, Sunday dinner parties, excursions, travelling, boating. Put aside, if you will, for one moment, the question, How far it is lawful or expedient for yourself individually—which, you say, is a concern between yourselves and God in the exercise of your personal liberty, and with which I have nothing to do—and ask yourselves, How about others; what has it cost them? Probably added a seventh day's hard work to six days' hard work, to provide a seventh day's enjoyment to your six days of pleasure. Or, if not, if you claim a day's enjoyment after six days of toil, why deny the same to others, and make impossible to them what you claim for yourselves?

"The Sabbath was made for man." These words are the Christian's "title deed" to the observance of the Sabbath day. Christ has herein left a great principle, but has not laid down the exact details on which that principle is to be carried out. What Christ has not imposed, we have no right arbitrarily to supply. That men, in the exercise of their liberty, should do so (as regards themselves) differently, is what we may expect.

But *what we may urge upon each* is that his observance of the Sabbath should be that which promotes the welfare, not of one part only, but of both parts equally, of his complex being.

What we may demand of each is that, for his own observance of the Sabbath day, he should, as far as possible, require nothing of others which may hinder, in any degree, a like observance on their part, of what they feel to be needful for the rest of their body, soul, and spirit.

The Rev. H. C. SHUTTLEWORTH, Minor Canon of St. Paul's.

THE need for insisting upon a right observance of Sunday was never greater than now. For the tendency of the time is to obscure the two great dominant ideas which underlie the institution of Sunday, and to which Sunday is the ordained witness. These great ideas are *worship* and *rest*. Mr. Ruskin has told us that "it is the essential feature of America . . . . to show men how not to worship; how never to be ashamed in the presence of anything." Mr. Herbert Spencer warned the Americans that their gravest social dangers lay in overwork. England has learned both lessons; the instinct of worship is largely wanting in her religion, and the need of rest is pressing hard upon all her workers. It is, therefore, especially necessary to bring out the observance of Sunday as the witness to worship and rest.

1. Sunday the witness to worship.

Our English religion is too self-centred. We go to church on Sunday to "get good," to hear sermons, or to ask blessings from God. But this is not the highest object of our Sunday assembling together. Surely we should come together to give, rather than to get; to rise out of self and above self; to contemplate the Divine Man; to worship Jesus Christ. Therefore, let us set before our people the highest act of Christian worship—

> " . . . that Mystery
> Where God-in-Man is one with Man-in-God."

No Sunday observance can be regarded as complete which does not centre in attendance at Holy Communion. Let us lay more stress upon this, and make more provision for this, that our Sunday may witness weekly to Christian worship at its highest.

Further; we need wider and more elastic forms of worship than those furnished by our Prayer Book. We who know and love that Book may be unwilling to admit that it does not meet the needs of all. But it cannot be denied. And in seeking for that which shall meet such needs, I fear we have been looking in a mistaken direction. God forbid that I should say one word against another man's way of worship, because it does not happen to be my way. But so far as I can judge, we shall not find what we want in a "shortened service," which mangles the office without meeting the need; or in any kind of imitation salvationism. Let us make larger use of pictures, of poetry, of music. Why not hang the bare, unattractive walls of our churches with paintings, and teach through the eye, instead of only through the ear? We are past the time when Popery was supposed to lurk in a picture. Why not take yet one more hint from our Nonconformist friends, and adopt their popular "services of song?" For example, what a service could be made out of readings from Keble's *Christian Year*, interspersed with songs and choruses from the great oratorios? This has, indeed, been tried with marked success, in a country church of this diocese; and the "Worship Hour" at St. Jude's, Whitechapel, has shown that East-enders can appreciate readings from the poets and selections from the great musicians. And if—remembering the grievous things I myself have suffered at the hands of choirs who *will* attempt elaborate anthems beyond their skill—I hesitate to suggest oratorio music at all; at least readings from Holy Scripture, from the great spiritual writers, from Wordsworth, Tennyson, Keble, may be alternated with simple psalms and hymns. No question of legality would be likely to arise, and might without difficulty be met. I have here a form of festal Christmas Eve service, consisting of carols, hymns, canticles and lessons, with benedictions *not* verbally taken from Bible or Prayer Book, which I am told was drawn up by his Grace the Primate for use in his late cathedral church. "How shall we get the people to church?" asks the Bishop of Bedford. Most heartily do I echo his answer, "*Anyhow!*" One point more. Let us leave our churches open between the services, and encourage the people to use them simply for quiet. We do not realise how great is the lack of peace and quiet in the lives of the poor. They will learn to value an open church, if only that they may sit there or kneel there and be quiet; while perhaps the organist plays soft music, and worship is born of silence.

2. Sunday the witness to rest.

There is one sense in which Sunday is too often a witness for unrest and discomfort; I mean the exceeding uncomfortableness of the seats in our churches. Our people cannot be expected to possess as yet, if ever, the ascetic spirit which finds wings for its worship in bodily discomfort. I frankly confess that I am one of the majority who feel it a weight, and not wings, to my prayers. I say nothing of the well-to-do classes; they can take care of themselves. But how can we expect a working-man or woman to come to church, when we ask them to sit on a seat like a mantel-shelf, or an unpleasant rush-bottomed chair which is too small for them? It is Mr. Besant, I think, in his most instructive East-end novel, *All Sorts and Conditions of Men* (I wish you would all go home and read it), who suggests plain, comfortable, wooden chairs, *with arms*, for the churches of the poor. Why not?

But it is of rest outside our churches on Sunday that I would chiefly speak. And in rest I include the recreation of mind and body, exhausted by the work of the week.

For dulness is not rest. Doing nothing is not rest. Standing about at the corners of the streets, waiting for the publics to open, is not rest. Real rest implies some healthful change of scene and occupation, as we all recognise when we take our own month's rest in the summer. My lord, when you spoke to us in your opening address of the Sunday boating on the Thames, I rejoiced to think that you were rebuking the rich and the idle, who can take their recreation on any day they please, but yet deprive their servants of their Sunday rest without necessity. The Fourth Commandment has much to say to them, and not least in its command to work on six days as well as to rest on one day. But I am sure your lordship did not mean for a moment to forbid the poor and the hard-worked from taking their Sunday rest in a boat on the river. God forbid that a Christian bishop, or a Church Congress, should seek to prevent the city clerk, drudging all the week in a dark and unhealthy office; the shop-assistant, who can only attend a meeting to promote early closing on Sunday, because he has not an hour in any day or evening in the week; the shop-girl, who cannot even sit down from dawn to dusk; the actor, the servant-maid, the artisan,—from breathing the pure air and enjoying the sight of green fields and the glory of God's sunlight, on the only day when they have leisure, because they do so in a boat on the Thames. We are all agreed that Sunday should be kept holy; but there are some of us who believe that this does not only mean worship and reading, and that the day may be faithfully observed in the spirit of Jesus Christ, even though a part of it be kept on the river or under the beeches. My lord, let us make our Sunday a true witness for rest; a testimony for brightness against dulness, for health against disease. Let the workers, of whatever class, pay their worship and enjoy their rest; and let the small minority, who must work to minister to both, be secured their Sabbath on another day. The time has come for us to roll away from the Church the too well-deserved reproach of being the Great Obstructive. Free the Sunday. Keep the shutters of the shops closed, and minimise compulsory Sunday work. But give the workers the opposite; permissible Sunday play. Open the doors of our national museums and picture-galleries on Sunday afternoons that the working-men, who help by their taxes to support them, may use them on their only possible day.

I will briefly anticipate objections.

1. "Pictures and antiquities are well enough, but Sunday is not the proper day for them." I cannot assent to this. I know of no authority save our own insular custom of two hundred years, which supports this objection. Not the rules of the Jewish Sabbath itself; not the custom of the early Church; not the teaching or practice of the English or German reformers. Further, all beauty and all wisdom are of God, and lead to God. Open galleries would help, rather than hinder, the religious observance of the day. The National Gallery has many a commentary upon the New Testament, the British Museum many an illustration of the Old. St. Paul's Cathedral has its aisles full of monuments, not too beautiful and not too Christian, and no voice forbids the people from looking at them. I would rather they could enjoy their Sunday rest and rise to their Sunday worship—I will not even say by the contemplation of

> "Titian's fiery woodlands,
> The saffron skies of Claude;"

but by looking upon the sweet child-angels of Raffaelle, the happy saints that Angelico painted upon his knees, the Gethsemane of Bellini, or Francia's "Entombment of the Christ!"

2. "This is the thin end of the wedge. Theatres and entertainments will follow."

The thin end of the wedge is in already. In the provinces many galleries and libraries have long been open, and no attempt has been made to open theatres. Moreover, what likeness is there between public institutions, open free, and private speculations for which you pay at the door? This argument has been used against every advance of progress, from steam-engines downwards; and ought to be discredited, if it is not. The workers are quite strong enough to take care of themselves, and to dictate their own terms.

3. "Opening these institutions will draw people from the churches." I do not believe it for a moment. And if it were so, the fault would not be in the picture-galleries, but elsewhere. I cannot think that this argument can be seriously advanced by men who really believe in the mission of the Church.

4. "The working-people do not want these places opened on Sunday." I am not so sure of that. Mr. Burt is as representative a working man as Mr. Broadhurst. Ask those who have tried Sunday picture-galleries: the rector of Bishopsgate, the vicar of St. Jude's, Whitechapel, whether those who attend on Sunday are working-men or not. I myself can testify of the working-people I have seen at the Grosvenor Gallery.

Besides, this is rather a dangerous argument for some of us to use. Do the majority of working-men want the churches open? At any rate, they do not go to them.

5. "Much compulsory work would be involved." That is true; though I believe it would be far less than is believed. But even now, we admit that some must work on Sunday; the clergy, the servants of the rich, the printers of Monday newspapers. I only desire to apply this principle for the benefit of the many rather than that of the few, and I would secure by law to the Sunday workers one day's freedom in each week.

6. "It is not wise to break down existing restrictions. The popular feeling does respect Sunday, in its own way. At least, it is not for us to destroy this feeling, even if it be only conventional." I reject this at once, for the simple reason that our Lord Jesus Christ did not act upon it, but upon that which seems opposed to it. Did He not continually break through conventional rules, for which Scripture authority was quoted? Yet He sanctified His own day as no Sabbath was ever sanctified before.*

7. "Atheists and heretics wish to open museums on Sunday. Why co-operate with such persons?" I have only to reply that if atheists and heretics are doing a good thing, I cannot see why a Christian may not join them. "All good counsels and all just works do proceed" from God; even those done by atheists. I should have thought it was not wise, indeed, to hold aloof, and let them stand before the people as workers for a good thing which the Church opposes. But if we are wrong, we at least err in good company. Charles Kingsley and Charles Lowder differed in many things, but they were agreed in this. For my part, I am not ashamed to stand where they stood, and to claim our Sunday, in the widest and most truly Christian sense, as the witness for the people's rest.

---

* See Maurice, *On the Sabbath*, p. 74.

DISCUSSION.

Mr. Clifton, of the Working Men's Lord's Day Rest Association.

As a Sabbath-breaker, and the son of a Sabbath-breaker, I lived part of my life, but thirty-six years ago I left off Sabbath-breaking. Both my father and myself were in the habit of working on Sundays, and we were both then in the Church of Rome. I had a family of six children to work for, and I was, as I am now, a watch-finisher by trade, working in my own home in Clerkenwell, for the watch manufacturers. One Sunday morning, my wife and children persuaded me to leave off work till the next day. On that evening, I wandered for the first time in my life into a Protestant place of worship, and I thank God for it, because, from that day to this, I have never willingly stayed away from worship on the Lord's Day. I soon became convinced that work on Sunday did not pay, and gave it up. I may say, also, that this is my thirtieth year of total abstinence, and, though I have turned sixty-eight years of age, I can work now with any man in the trade ; and I believe a good deal of that is the result, with God's blessing, of Sabbath keeping and total abstinence. We want a remedy for Sabbath-breaking. We have been in the habit of prosecuting, but I do not believe in it. Christ never sent us into the world to go upon the sheep like wolves. When I worked on the Sunday, I thought I was doing right, and I should not have liked to be prosecuted when I thought that. I have been about twenty years a member of the Committee of the Working Men's Lord's Day Rest Association, and I found that we could do nothing with the adults. Sixteen years ago, however, I started a society, called the Juvenile Sabbath Union, not for prosecuting anybody, but for influencing the children, and I have found that if you do not act upon them by love, you need not attempt to influence them at all. I remember that at one of our meetings, when the Earl of Shaftesbury was in the chair, a clergyman gave a story of a working man who had not been in a place of worship for forty-two years, until he was induced to go to church by a little grand-child, who was a member of the Sabbath School Union. The Earl of Shaftesbury, on hearing the incident, said that the clergy could not get to the men directly, and the children could ; by all means let the children be employed in the good work, and, if the children brought the parents, by God's blessing there would yet be a Sabbath-keeping generation.

The Rev. C. D. Du-Port, One of Her Majesty's Inspectors of Schools, Reading.

I have a few words, that I think are of importance, to say on this evening's subject. The question of Sunday observance will divide itself at once under two heads. We have to think of the element of worship on the Sunday on the one hand, and of the question of how to spend the day of rest outside the house of worship on the other. But first, may I express a hope that on one particular point our hands, as a Congress, may, on future occasions, be made much stronger than they now are. I regret only one thing in connection with the preparatory and actual work of this year's Congress, and that is, that we have not been able yet to bring forward, as definite members of our Congress Committees, representatives of the wage-earning class ; for such men would truly represent the difficulties and the feelings of that class, and speak out openly to us both the opinion of that class, and the grounds for that opinion on this question of Sunday observance that touches them so closely. A very honoured name fell from the lips of the last speaker—the name of a man noble in title, and nobler still in life—Lord Shaftesbury, whom one and all of us respect and revere. It was not many months ago that Lord Shaftesbury said he believed that two per cent. was a very common percentage of the working men attending places of worship in many portions of the Metropolis ; and there were those by him on the platform who seemed almost to endorse the remark as true of England generally. If this be the case, you will see how important it is that we should have on the Committee of the Congress wage-earning men, having the confidence of their fellows, and able to speak openly and freely to us about the circumstances of the class they represent. Now, with regard to the opening of museums, I am not even going at present

to tell you my own opinion; but I will tell you how the question stands at present with a great many people of deepest thought and piety. It is but a balance of superlatives with very many of them. A great many say that there is much to be said for the opening of museums, and very much to be said against it; whilst another section alters its superlatives, and says there is very much to be said for opening museums, and much against it. I shall not attempt to strike that balance to-night, but rather I want you to-night to assert a position of consistency on this museum question. I would point out that there are museums and museums. There is a museum close by this hall, where there are glass cases filled with the most interesting things, speaking of matters of interest connected with our world and race, and speaking in many instances of solemn truths redounding to the honour of God; and those who show them to you ask no money for letting you see them. But, there are museums of another type, and but too many of them, the cases in which are also made of glass, though of very different shape and appearance; standing not as cases of natural curiosities about a room to interest the mind, but as phials of intoxicating drinks, adapted to tempt the human palate, and, if taken in excess, to debase the human soul. These museums, where pleasure is offered not gratis, but for sale, are now left open; while the other museums of elevating and refining tendencies are kept closed. Let us be consistent in this matter. If we are to have the museums closed on the Sunday, let us say that they shall all be closed whether they contain bottles of intoxicating drinks or articles of scientific curiosity. But can we do nothing towards promoting rational, popular Sunday recreation? I remember, not long ago, spending delightful Sunday evenings in North Wales, with the mountains rising above us, and the great sea stretching out before us. We had had our church services; and thousands were assembled at the head of the pier, many of us perhaps feeling still the part we had been taking in the worship of God. Working men were present by thousands; and there we listened to the moving strains of Handel's music, rendered sometimes by the instrumental band, and sometimes by a strong good singer's voice. I certainly shall never regret the way in which I spent those Sunday evenings. In that music there was nothing that could do ought but honour the day; and I was pleased to think that those working people were listening spell-bound to the refining tones of Haydn, or to the elevating notes of Handel, or of Mendelssohn. Can we do nothing here ourselves to help on after this fashion a wholesome Sunday observance during those hours that do not call our people to their actual Sunday worship? Let us Reading people make up our minds that we will do something in this direction towards counteracting the many evil influences by which the Sunday observance of the working people is so much injured, and its character so much lowered. Even in our villages much could be done in this way, by a little philanthropic work. You cannot, of course, produce mountains at command; you cannot bring ocean scenery into your parishes; but you can take the things you have; you can use such musical talent as is at hand; you can at least make a parallel effort in the direction of my Welsh Sunday performances with such means as are at your command; and if you do so, I cannot but think that you will be doing something towards bettering the observance of our Sundays outside Church hours. Speaking now of that fact of Sunday observance which bears upon Church worship, and the working classes in their relation to it, you must draw them in by the agency of preaching, carried out in a style and language understanded of the people. I fully feel the importance of what has been said about short and varied as well as longer and ordinary services, and about short and special as well as longer and ordinary sermons, for drawing to the Church the people who will not now come. But there is one thing still lacking. Would that the date of this Congress might be that from which my lords on the episcopal bench might be moved to the determination of establishing, before it is too late, an order of preachers, ordained to preach—men chosen because they can preach—an order of men trained in such a way that early-dawning talent should be raised and elevated to something more and more perfect. Under their influence you would find that your churches, now comparatively empty of the wage-earning class, would unquestionably become more and more full. But I wish for a step further yet. I speak as one who has had for four years a hand upon the missionary plough. No man who has ever touched that plough can dream of success without the help of a native ministry. As soon as you have that the battle feels as if half won. Now, it seems to me, that we shall never get Lord Shaftesbury's two per cent. of working class Church attendance turned into ninety per cent, till, by some revival of the diaconate, or by some other similar measure, we are able to choose and use from among the working classes preachers who shall be accredited by the bishop to assist the ordinary clergy of the parish in preaching to the working class; men of the people pleading with the people,

h-less if you like, ungrammatical if you please, but sound in heart and strong in sense ; and both in sympathy with and understanded of the people. Granted that we may not like an h-less preacher, or an ungrammatical oratory ; but at any rate we shall all agree that it is better to have lost h-s than to have lost souls.

The Rev. Stewart D. Headlam.

The late Dean of Westminster said that Sunday was so good an institution that it was worth preserving, and therefore worth reforming. Adopting that very good sentence, I can agree most cordially with almost all that the Dean of York and Mr. Moore said about the sacredness of Sunday. It is because I believe that Sunday is a most sacred institution, one of the most holy institutions given to us by the Church of Jesus Christ, and because I feel we are bound to be loyal to the very smallest iota of Jesus Christ's teaching, that I also feel that it is our bounden duty to do far more than we have hitherto done in the way of making Sunday really a delight to the great majority of the English working people. I wish, with all the force I can, to endorse what Mr. Shuttleworth has said. I am sure you, my lord President, have been misunderstood very widely indeed. Almost all the London papers have had it that you think it very wrong for the hard-working Londoners, clerks, girls and boys from workshops and factories, and other workers, to go out on the river on a Sunday afternoon. I wish to endorse Mr. Shuttleworth's statement as strongly as possible, and to maintain that we are only loyal to Jesus Christ, who took pains to work against disease, when we not only say that such people may go out, but that it is their duty to go out on the Sunday. Those who say otherwise should consider very carefully indeed whether they are not doing wrong in making the hearts of the people sad, whom God has not made sad, and whether they are not alienating people from the Church and from religion by the dreadfully gloomy and grim notions about God and religion which are put before them. It has been said that now at last clergymen are beginning to care about what the workmen of England say. I hope that on some future occasion we shall be addressed by an even more representative working man than we have had before us to-night. If I had known that working men were to be invited to speak at this Congress, I could have brought hundreds to speak in favour of the opening of museums on Sunday. It has been said that the working classes of England do not want this relaxation of Sunday observance, and Mr. Broadhurst is generally quoted as a proof of that statement. I know Mr. Broadhurst well, and he is a good, honest dissenter. Long before he became a trades-unionist leader he spoke out as he does now. Of course we cannot expect dissenters to be with us in this matter. They do not believe that God is a God of brightness and mirth. The old Puritanical spirit has not yet disappeared, and they have darkened God's character to a great degree. Do not be deceived into thinking that Mr. Broadhurst is on this subject the representative of the English trades unionists, and if he were, they are not the representatives of the English labourers. They are the aristocrats of labour, and behind them is the large mass of unorganised labour for which we want this relaxation. The last speaker said that, as we have museums closed, we ought also to have public-houses closed compulsorily on Sunday. I will only say that, as far as my experience goes, if you want to see a real riot in our large English towns you will close the public-houses, and keep the museums closed on Sundays. It would be an absolute cruelty to give the large mass of the working people no place where they can get real, honest recreation and refreshment. It was well that we should have our attention called to the fact that the people who have disturbed the pleasant quietness of the river about here are those who do not work at all during the week. Instead of condemning them and others for taking pleasure on a Sunday, I think it would be well to see that things are so altered that they will be bound to work during the week. It is only because amusements can be degraded by those who do no work that people have got it into their heads that there is something wrong in amusements on Sunday altogether. As churchmen, what we have to do is to put before people many more opportunities of worshipping Jesus Christ early in the morning, and then encourage them with a good conscience to enjoy God's beautiful nature in the afternoon. This is what, to a great extent, is done in the much-abused Continental Sunday. Of course, in the present disorganised social state, a great deal of work would be forced on people who have already too much work ; but that is just as bad on week-days as on Sunday, and the remedy must come from some tremendous social reorganisation which would enable

people to have plenty of leisure, both on the week-day and on the Sunday. On the whole, the Continental Sunday is not so much a day of work as a day, first of all of worship, and then of genuine amusements, and so much the better. There is one other form of Sunday observance which I wish to put before the Congress. There are a large number of people who are alienated from our worship, and from ordinary religious instruction. We have duties towards them which we could well fulfil on certain Sunday evenings, and to do so we should try to gather these people together in halls and schoolrooms, and lecture to them and discuss the matters on which we differ. That experiment has been tried by a society of which I am warden, and it has been, on a small scale, generally successful. I beg to recommend the point to the attention of my brother clergy, and to remind them that they have duties to the agnostics and the atheists, and to ask them to discuss fairly and honestly the points on which they differ from us. May I be allowed, finally, to clinch what I have said by reminding you that the Church Catechism, in its explanation of the Fourth Commandment, makes it clear to us that Sabbatarian teaching is to be no part of the Church's teaching. We are there taught to serve God truly all the days of our life. The Christian Sunday is to bear witness to the sacredness of all days, and that clearly explains the difficulty which was put before the Congress by the President with respect to those who do not serve God by earning their own living on the six days, and who make the river a nuisance to his lordship and others on the seventh.

The Right Rev. the PRESIDENT.

MAY I just say a single word? The last speaker has said that someone in London has reported me as wishing to forbid some poor working people to take their recreation on Sunday. May I just say that the kind of revel held on the river at Maidenhead is not frequented by any poor people whatever, but by people at the other end of the social scale? I merely mean that I did not say what has been attributed to me.

The Rev. EDWARD HOARE, Hon. Canon of Canterbury and Vicar of Tunbridge Wells.

THE subject has been regarded as a working man's question, and we accept the position. We are prepared to say that there is no class more anxious for the Christian happiness of the working man than those who earnestly desire to keep the Lord's-day as a holy and sanctified day. We wish to see the working man happy. We wish to see the working man enjoy his Sunday as a happy, delightful day; we wish to see the man who works hard for our comfort during the week enjoying, on the Sunday, a delightful peace as we ourselves enjoy it in our homes. We also believe, and believe most decidedly, that the Church and the home are the great seats of the happy enjoyment of the Lord's most holy day. I go a step further, and I am prepared to maintain with my whole heart and soul that it is for the sake of the working man that we are most anxious to maintain the holiness of the Day of God. I look upon the Sunday as God's most gracious, loving, merciful gift to the sons of toil. God has stepped in between the employer and the employed, and has decided, on behalf of the employed, that he is to have that holy day of rest. Let us bear in mind two truths. The first is that the only safeguard for those who are dependent on their labour for their bread is the Divine safeguard which God has put upon that day. The law of the land cannot preserve it. The law of the Church cannot enforce it. Who can enforce it? Is it not one of the great miracles of Christendom that, notwithstanding all the avarice of the world, the increase of competition, the struggle in some for gain, and in others for livelihood, the sacred day is preserved and remains a monument of the lovingkindness of our God? If you take away God's authority you take away the one safeguard of the working man, and you let loose on him two powers—the love of gain and the love of pleasure—the love of gain forcing him to labour for fear of losing his situation; the love of pleasure compelling one man to give up the gift which God has given him in order that another man may have that which he calls a day of recreation. The second truth is that the day which He appoints is a holy day,

and the rest He bestows a holy rest; so that if we give up the holiness we cannot appeal to the authority. I was much encouraged in observing a statement, although I have not the report by me, that in the Congress of the Trades Unions last week they had come to the conclusion that they did not desire the opening of museums and other places on the Sunday because they considered it would involve additional labour for the working man. I believe they are right. Mr. Stewart Headlam says that these trades unions were the aristocracy of labour. Well, then, we churchmen will stand up for the democracy of labour—for those who are dependent on the aristocracy of labour for their employment, so that the aristocracy may not be able for their pleasure to rob the democracy of the sacred gift which God has given them. Reference has been made to the Continental Sunday. I once spent two Sundays in Paris. I saw in the street where I was lodging the paviours working at the improvement of the road on Sunday. Was that recreation? I saw the masons and bricklayers building a row of houses in the next street. Was that recreation? I saw whole rows of shops, jewellers' and others, all open, and young people serving in those shops. Was that recreation? I had to preach in a church on the further side of the Champs Elysés, and I had to cross the Champs Elysés to get to the church on the Sunday afternoon. I did so at the peril of my life. That great broad avenue was filled with carriages, many abreast, driving to and fro, and it was with the utmost possible difficulty and danger that I crossed the road. What became of these men? Was it recreation for all those that drove, for all those that kept the horses, for all who were contributing to the afternoon of pleasure? The sanctity was gone and the rest had followed, as it ever will if the principle is adopted that after going, I suppose, to Mass in the morning, they may have a day of recreation. I remember a lady saying to me, "Don't you think if I go to church in the morning, it is only fair that I should have the rest of the day for myself?" Is that, I ask, keeping the day holy? Is that keeping the day with the whole heart for God? The holy day!—it is the happy day; the holy day!—it is the whole day. I ask, has the omnibus man no family, no wife, no children to sit on his knee and to enjoy a happy, delightful evening with their father?—have the engineers of trains and the engineers of steamboats no claim on society to protect them? Who is it that pleads for the working man? Is it he who says that the man who is secure perhaps of his two or three pounds a week may rob of his Sunday's rest the other poor man who has only his pound a week, and who may lose that if he objects to work on Sunday? Is he the friend of working men? No! The friend of the working man is he that looks up to the Lord who gave the Sunday, to maintain the day which He has given; is he that, with his eye fixed upon his Blessed Saviour's great grace, rejoices in the shield which He has thrown over the sons of toil, and speaks of Sunday as a delight. Aye, and it is a delight; and how many working men are there who look upon it as the great delight of their lives? But while they think it a delight they regard it as such because it is at the same time—and this is the reason of the joy—the holy of the Lord and honourable.

W. G. F. Phillimore, Esq., D.C.L., Chancellor of the Diocese of Lincoln.

I wish to lay before the Congress one or two considerations which have not yet been fully touched upon, and the first is this. If you look into the New Testament you will find ample evidence of the keeping of the first day of the week as a day of religious observance; but you will find no mention anywhere of its being kept as a Sabbath, as a day of rest, or of abstinence from amusement. My second consideration is this: that it is quite clear that in the first three centuries the Christians did not keep the Sunday as a day of rest. We know very well that as soon as the Christian sect began to be known, enquiries were made into its habits, and reports were made by the officials to the emperors on the subject. Apologies were also written by the leading Christians themselves, and the principal Christian practices were mentioned in them; but in neither one nor the other, so far as I am aware, is there any mention of the Christians treating Sunday as different from any other day, except in the matter of religious worship. More than that, when the days of persecution came, as they did from time to time, the Christians were detected through their peculiar practices, and over and over again they were discovered because of the

courage with which they abstained from doing things which they thought were wrong. I believe, however, there is no trace anywhere of anybody being detected to be a Christian by reason of his refusing to do work on a Sunday. If this be so, to abstain from work on the Sunday is neither scriptural nor primitive. Where does the practice come from? Is it Protestant? I answer, no. The great Continental Reformers knew nothing of it, as the great Protestant nations of the Continent know nothing of it now. The Sunday which we know in England and in Scotland is not known at Geneva, or Rotterdam, or in Northern Germany; one example is as good as a hundred. We in England and Scotland are familiar with a very much reduced service of trains on Sunday; has anybody ever turned over the Continental Bradshaw and noticed what a different state of things prevails on the Continent? Where else, then, do we find an observance of Sunday like that which is known to us? It is purely insular. It may be good or bad, but it is surely to be defended, not on religious grounds, but on grounds, if anything, of social economy. What is the religious obligation with regard to Sunday? Clearly to attend Divine worship. But it is agreed on all hands that you cannot spend the whole of the day in Divine worship; what are you to do during the rest of the day? Is there anything entirely prohibited? There is only one thing prohibited, you must not so enjoy yourselves as to trench seriously on the enjoyment of others. But I venture to say that Sunday is a feast day, a day of worship, and a day not of rest but of recreation. Then comes the question, how are you to have recreation? It is all very well in the country and in small country towns to answer the question, because there the people can enjoy themselves well enough among the flowers and birds. What are you to do in London? It is said that you may walk in the parks, but that makes labour for the park-keepers; suppose you live far away from the parks, or have women and children to look after, are there to be no omnibuses and tram-cars to convey you there? If you want to go to Richmond Park are you not to be allowed to use the railway? Then, if you are to go into the parks, is it to be forbidden that you should hear music? All these things, of course, entail labour; is it not the truth that in this matter the few must labour for the advantage of the many, the few having ample opportunities afforded them of taking rest on other days. It is not necessary that the same omnibus driver or engine driver or park-keeper should work on every Sunday. The same thing applies to museums. There could be no difficulty in arranging that the same persons should not be employed in the museums every Sunday, but should have opportunities given them for Sunday devotion. Twenty years ago, when eleven and three were the only hours of religious service, to tell a man that he must be on duty in a museum from eleven till four was to tell him that he should not go to church. But now-a-days there are plenty of opportunities for church going before eleven and after four. Ascension Day is a day of as hard work to many of us as any day in the year, and yet there is no difficulty in any large town for a hard-worked man to go to church on that day. There are plenty of people who cannot choose their own hours of recreation, whereas there are many who can work hard and yet select the time for recreation. Such people as the latter can, no doubt, find time in the week to go to museums and picture galleries; but are those who cannot find the time during the week to be refused permission to go on the Sunday? It has been said by Canon Hoare that the Sunday is the day for church and home. But how if you have no home; what is the home of large numbers in our community like? Is it any enjoyment to these people that they should be kept, one out of twelve perhaps, in a small, stifling room which serves all purposes by night and day. They must be out, and if they are not in the streets or the parks they must be either in the public-house or the music-hall. Then, there are the wet days; in wet days even the parks are denied to these people, and during the time the churches are shut their only chance now is to go into the public-house. Surely it would be better to give them the opportunity of going into the museums as well.

The Rev. C. L. MARSON, St. Jude's, Whitechapel.

I AM a Sabbatarian of the extremest sort; I believe the Sabbath is an institution which has existed as long as man has, and long before the Jews were even heard of, and being a law of our nature, I believe that what we want is more Sabbath and not less. I have often been grieved to have an excellent sermon of a clergyman on the subject of the Sabbath day spoilt for me by the remembrance that the

preacher has violated it himself by working seven days in the week, profaning the Sabbath and not being blameless, and I have often been shocked by seeing religious people doing their utmost to prevent the rest that is needful being given to their poorer brethren, owing to slavish Sabbatarianism. In our parish some little time ago, we had an art exhibition and flower show on Sunday, and both of them were crowded by the working classes, which is much greater evidence of what the opinion of the working classes really is than any number of isolated cases brought before us. "Want of occupation is not rest," and surely the literary man and others who work with their heads ought to rest by going out on the river, and into the country, and let the agricultural labourer devote himself to reading of the sort that will be the best rest for him after working hard all the week. And what are we to do with our mechanics in Whitechapel, whose home consists of one room, where even decency is almost impossible? On the Sunday where are these men to go for rest? They are to be either driven into churches, where the whole service and the sermon too are usually antiquated, dull, and unintelligible, or they are allowed to drift into the gin palaces, seeking rest and finding none. I hope this Congress will give its voice most heartily on the side of opening all manner of libraries, museums, and picture galleries, that it will do its best to promote all innocent recreation on Sunday, such as light and pretty songs and dancing; that it will do its best to preach to capitalists who would employ their labourers seven days in the week, the iniquity of so doing, that it will lift its voice against seven days of labour, whether for the railway porter, tram-car man, the parson, or any one else; whether the Sabbath breaker employs six days in watchmaking, and one day in hard work as a Sunday school teacher, or in any other form. I hope this Congress will lift its voice on behalf of the true Sabbath of rest and recreation once a week, not the Sabbath of day worshipping and dreary fanaticism, which becomes a weariness to the flesh and spirit too. Do not let us, a body of clergymen, Christians for the most part, let it go forth that we are such sceptics as to believe that if picture galleries, museums, and the like were open they could compete with us who have a message of rest for heavy-laden and over-worked humanity, and who can offer to them the rest and peace which passes all understanding.

The Rev. Henry G. Tomkins, late Vicar of Branscombe.

I have but little to say, but I will speak with no uncertain voice to-night. I think I can show sufficient reason by the laws of God and man for not opening museums and national picture-galleries on Sundays. I speak with the deepest feeling in the matter and some degree of knowledge, for I am somewhat familiar with the British Museum, where there is employed a large class of of our fellow-citizens who are worthy of all esteem and honour. They are men highly qualified for their important duties; they are custodians of those invaluable antiquities and art treasures which are kept in that building, and many of them have grown greyheaded in the service of the nation. They are the servants of the nation, and I am speaking only of institutions which belong to the nation and to you and me as shareholders, because we belong to the great Christian English nation. Call them servants of John Bull if you will. John Bull was brought up a Christian, and has been a merciful, sympathetic master to his servants. You tell him to say to these men, "For the sake of others you must work on the Sunday; you must give up, at any rate, some of your Sunday"—who can tell how much—who can tell what progressive part of the Sunday is to be lopped off? But never mind that. Sunday is a whole day. John Bull says for the first time in his long life to his servants at the British Museum, the National Gallery, and the South Kensington Museum, "My good fellows, I find I must make you work on the Sunday." Some of them will shake their heads and say, "I had rather not;" some will say, "Oh, let us off; let us have our Sundays to ourselves;" some will say, "I won't work on Sunday." Then says John Bull to his faithful old servants, "I am very sorry, but you must." A good, staunch old Christian greyheaded servant says, "I cannot; I have a Master above you, Mr. John Bull. I have a Lord who is on high. I must answer to Him one day for what I have done with all my Sundays, and I will not." What is to come of this? I appeal to all England; I appeal to Christians. What the Christians did with the Lord's-days in the first three centuries is very hard to find out. It is very hard to prove a negative as to what they would

refuse in the matter, and it is an exceedingly difficult subject of archaic inquiry. But this I do say, that the Lord's-day is a day which has been held honourable in England, and England has not been the less honoured for honouring the Sunday. Wherever the Sunday may come from, however it may have been derived by us, it is so blessed, so holy, so happy, so joyous an invention, so delightful, so holy to the Lord and honourable, that I think if it came from nowhere else—if it did not come from the first, second, or third centuries, it came straight from heaven. To appeal to a Parisian Sunday, to a Sunday of Geneva, or a Sunday of Rotterdam, is a very misplaced appeal in a Church Congress of England. I should like to see such a Church Congress, such a Church at Geneva or Rotterdam. You will never for a long time see such a living Church as the Church of England at Geneva or Rotterdam. You will see plenty of freethinking, plenty of unlawful inventions; you will see at Geneva the headquarters of Nihilism from all parts of the world; you will see at Rotterdam so dead-alive a place in the matter of religion that it is sorrowful to go into the churches there. Are we to follow the example of Geneva and Rotterdam in the matter of the Sunday? If the Swiss and the Dutch make their servants work and force them to work, and if they are so far from making that holy day a delight and the holy of the Lord, if they are willing to keep their shops open and to sell their jewellery and nicknacks on the Sunday, are we to imitate them? No! I make my appeal to our experience of all the blessedness of a Christian Sunday. Our experience may be insular, but so was Noah's Ark. I think the Church of Christ has been often compared with Noah's Ark, and an uncommonly insular thing Noah's Ark was, wherein eight persons were saved. But wherever our Sunday comes from let us hold to it staunchly and guard it for every English citizen. Keep up the wall of fire around about, and pray to our Almighty Saviour to be the glory in the midst.

TOWN HALL,

THURSDAY EVENING, OCTOBER 4TH.

The Ven. ARCHDEACON POTT in the Chair.

THE SERVICES OF THE CHURCH AND THEIR ADAPTATION TO MODERN NEEDS.

PAPERS.

The BISHOP OF BEDFORD.

ONE is greatly distracted, dragged about to this side and to that, by conflicting thoughts and experiences, in this matter of the services of the Church. On the one side how one thanks God for the marvellous growth of all that is seemly, and reverent, and devotional, in the worship of our Church! It is all but impossible now to conjure up a vision of the baldness, and dreariness, and slovenliness, which prevailed even half a century ago. You would have to travel about a good while in this country before you would stumble upon a church where the arrangements and services are such as were all but universal then. It is true you might be taken to such a church under intelligent guidance.

I could take you to a certain church in Cumberland, where my grandfather was rector, and where only a few years ago I renewed my acquaintance with the mighty three-decker, the central portion of which, being the reading-desk, has a door which, as it opens, brings out a flight of stairs with it, a contrivance which greatly impressed my childish imagination, as well as with the dim green-baize-lined square pews, and all the wonderful arrangements which seem now to belong to pre-Adamite man. But really now-a-days, if you wish to find without difficulty churches in which there is no kneeling, no responding, a paid quartette in a gallery, and the absence of any apparent conception of worship, you must cross the Atlantic and go to the far west. Our cousins boast that they are a-head of us in many things. They are certainly a long way behind us in the realisation of worship. Yes; "God hath done great things for us already, whereof we rejoice." We do thank God for the beauty, and reverence, and order, and solemnity, of our Church services. This on the one side. But there is another side. I am writing this in a lovely and secluded valley, whither I have come for a little rest and change. There is a little Chapel-of-Ease close by, where I have been conducting the services. I could not help noticing a number of labouring men on the back benches without Prayer-books or hymn-books; they looked very stolid, and I do not think they were able to understand or enter into much of the service. I tried to preach to these poor fellows, and selected the dullest-looking, resolved to try and get at least some one idea into his head. Whether I succeeded or not I cannot tell. But I could not help wishing I could have a little adapted the service also to their capacities. But, again, a working-man in East London has been sick; the clergyman has visited him, and helped him, and impressed him with sincere wishes to do better. When he recovers he comes to church. He can read well enough, but the Prayer Book is too much for him; he cannot find his places, and as he cannot bear displaying his ignorance, he does not come again.

Now I am sure we shall all agree in the desire that the Church should in her services and ministrations consider all classes. She is already in the minds of a very large number of our people far too much identified with one class. "To the poor the Gospel is preached." Yes but a great many of these poor say—"Oh, the Church is for the rich;" and, alas! there are strong class feelings and class prejudices which make "The Church is for the rich," much the same thing as "The Church is not for the poor." This is a danger, as well as a wrong. Of course I know that I am touching now upon a far wider subject than that upon which I am asked to write, but no one can deny that the character or rendering of our Church services may have a very marked bearing upon this class feeling towards the Church. If the bulk of the people—the labouring class—could reasonably argue that the services in our Churches are such as they cannot understand or enter into, they would at least have a good excuse for their notion that the Church is for a different class, and is more careful for the tastes and habits of the rich, than anxious to provide for the simpler wants of the poor.

Now I will confess at once that I do think we have, in at least some cases, given our working-classes ground for such a notion. I have occasionally, when taking part in the service of a Church placed among

a poor population, had continually in my mind a sense of the unsuitableness of the Service to the needs of the people. I have felt with pain how little the poor could appreciate a service, which to a minority of those present might be enjoyable enough. For example, I have been made quite unhappy in hearing what is known as the Mechlin use—a less simple and more artificial rendering of the Choral service than Tallis'—with inflected Collect, and the like, where I have felt a more simple rendering would be far more acceptable to the bulk of the worshippers. And I may say that the class next above the labouring—a class from which dissenting chapels draw very largely—is no less sensitive to what gives, whether justly or unjustly, an impression of a performance, of something external and unreal, than the working-classes themselves. I have been told—"Oh, the people will learn to like it, when they get used to it!" Ah, well, but life is short, and we don't want to lose more time than we can help in getting into our souls the idea of worship; and people who come and have not got used to it, may possibly not care for the process of getting used to it.

What do I deduce from these counter views? Simply the need for greater variety, and larger power of adaptation in our Church services than we at present possess. It would be a terrible mistake to pare down our beautiful services to a meagre baldness, supposed to be more suitable to the uncultured masses. We want a loving enthusiasm for our Church services; and, as on the one hand we can get this only from those able to enter fully into them, so on the other hand, we can get it from them only by enriching our services with all the beauty, and dignity, and solemnity which we can command. The very last person I should consult in this matter of the adaptation of our Church services is Procrustes. You cannot have one type of service which suits everybody. But another deduction I make from the counter views I have adduced is the need of greater consideration on the part of clergy and choirs (for the choirs are sometimes as deficient in this point as the clergy) for the peculiar habits and tastes of the population for which the church is provided. A service, which would be delighted in in May Fair, will not attract equally in Bethnal Green. I am sure we are all tempted too much to indulge our own tastes in the lesser externals of worship, and to ignore the feelings of our people. A little self-denial and self-repression in these things would often do wonders. We forget how slow we were ourselves in learning to understand and appreciate many things in our worship. Do let us be very patient with, and very considerate for, others. Their objections may be, probably are, very silly, but they have souls to be saved, and we may sorely hinder our chances of helping them in the great work, while we are stickling for little things which we think correct, or which a young sacristan assures us are correct, but which to these poor silly souls are distracting and unedifying. We want real sympathy with our people, and great tenderness in dealing with their weaknesses.

But, while it is quite true that different types of service suit different classes of worshippers, it is no less true that there is room for different types of service in the same Church and parish. We in East London are largely using exceedingly simple mission services, sometimes in mission-rooms and school-rooms, sometimes after the evening service

in Church; and we find by experience that these mission services are distinctly feeders to our Church system, leading many, who have never previously attended any place of worship, to become Church-goers, and to pass on to Confirmation and Holy Communion. It is often objected that Mission and Evangelistic Services are accepted by the people as a substitute for Church-going, and so teach them to rest content with a very meagre conception of worship. All I can say is that, where such is the case, it is the fault of the clergy or others in conducting the services. There is really no difficulty in making the mission-room the ante-chamber to the Church.

But we do want greater power to vary our services, and to adapt them to special seasons and occasions. Many will doubtless know the valuable little services for various occasions put forth by the Vicar of Great Yarmouth. They seem to me to be excellent models for such occasional services. The last which has appeared, being a Service for the Promotion of Unity, is enriched by some rhythmical portions of great beauty, by the Rev. S. T. Stone, the author of "The Church's One Foundation." We are greatly hampered in the production of such services (at least for use in Church) by the limitation to materials taken from the Bible or Prayer Book imposed upon us by the so-called "Shortened Services Act." There is a rich mine of liturgical wealth in the Ancient Sacramentaries and Service Books, for a popular acquaintance with which we are so much indebted to the labours of Canon Bright, if we were only allowed to work the mine. A committee of Convocation had drawn up a very beautiful Additional Service for Sunday use, chiefly from such ancient sources, when the Act I have named came and nullified all their labour, and compelled them to put forth a very much less satisfactory service in compliance with its restrictions. I cannot see why we need fear a very considerable amount of freedom in the use of *additional* services in our churches, if such use were guarded by the necessity for Episcopal sanction. Nor does there seem any reason why, on certain occasions, as especially during Parochial Missions, extempore prayer should not be permitted. The extreme popularity and deep impressiveness of the very simple "Three Hours" Service on Good Friday, in a large and increasing number of churches, is a proof that our people can and do appreciate a variation from our stereotyped services. Of course that particular service, consisting, as it does, only of meditations on the Seven Words of our Lord, with intervening hymns, collects, and short spaces for silent prayer, is entirely within the legal limits. But the very popular Harvest Service, compiled by Convocation many years ago, and used in a great many churches, is unfortunately not so. The mention of the "Shortened Services Act," leads me to refer very briefly to the encouragement there given to the re-arrangement of the Sunday services by the permission to divorce the Sermon from the Communion Office, and to make the Litany a separate service. This is gradually leading to two methods of arrangement, which seem to meet the wants of the people. According to one plan, which is frequent in country churches, on one Sunday there is an Early Celebration, followed at eleven o'clock by Matins, Litany, and Sermon; and on the next a late Celebration after Matins and Sermon, the Litany being postponed to the afternoon. According to the other plan, more

adapted for large town parishes, there is an Early Celebration each Sunday, Matins (with or without Litany) and Sermon at eleven o'clock, and then the Communion Office, with a second Celebration, often choral, after a slight interval.

On the whole, what I should desire would be to preserve intact the dignity and beauty of our Church services, and to train up our people in every possible way to the intelligent appreciation and reverent use of them. And let me plead earnestly for the far more general observance of the Church's rule as to Daily Prayer. If two or three simple villagers are all that can come together, they are at least the "two or three," and we are not despising our Church's order. But then I would allow great freedom in supplementing the regular stated services. Where people have not learnt to worship, I would occasionally have mere preaching, with two or three collects and hymns. And I would, in all ways consistent with reverence and devotion, endeavour to meet the actual wants of the people. God grant our dear old Church may more and more prove itself, not the Church of the rich alone, nor the Church of the poor alone, but the Church of the peopie.

The Rev. CANON MEDD, Rector of North Cerney, Cirencester.

DOES the word "Services," in our subject, mean our existing services only, or the services which the Church, which should be "all things to all men that she might gain the more," might, could, should, or ought to offer, for the glory of God, and for the spiritual upraising of the masses committed to her care? Since this is uncertain we must take it both ways. And

I. Of our existing services: The first necessary "adaptation to modern needs" is the *more frequent and regular use of them,* in simple obedience to the Church's express command. My own belief is that the neglect of the daily worship of God and the daily intercession for His people has been—I wish I could say *has been*, and not *is*—one of the most flagrant and crying sins of the English clergy since the Reformation. Closed churches, unused churches, a merely Sunday religion, a popular persuasion that the parson has nothing to do, and does it, all the week, are surely very obvious causes of weakness; and such as must, if not removed, draw down on our whole Church some proportional judicial punishment. Our *aim* in all parishes, even the most backward, should be *weekly and festival communion.* Our *immediate practice* in all, without exception, should be daily Matins or Evensong, and ultimately both, and Wednesday and Friday Litany, at such hours as may be most convenient for the greatest number of the people; hours which will therefore vary somewhat with the season of the year. The objection to their length is now removed by the Shortened Services Act. We can omit the Exhortation, the Venite, the Old Testament Lesson, and its Canticle; and we can divide the Intercessions and Thanksgiving between morning and evening. More shortening than this is mutilation; and especially the intolerable omission of the second Lord's Prayer, which is the keystone of the arch, the very gem, centre and kernel of the whole office, around which, as the primary nucleus of

crystallization, all else has grown, to which all that precedes leads up, of which all that follows is the expansion. Some shortening was necessary. But the outcry against long services was much more an outcry against services too monotonous and unvarying, the Psalms, Lessons and Collect being the only variable portions. Hence we need adaptation in two forms. 1. *From existing Prayer Book materials.* We want an understood and allowed discretional liberty to the clergy to insert in a shortened daily service, and even on occasions, on Sundays also, additional prayers and collects from the Prayer Book, as follows;—

1. On *Fridays*, the Palm Sunday, or the first Good Friday Collect, or Easter II., after the Collect of the day, and

2. On *Minor Saints' Days*, the All Saints' Collect.

3. After the Intercession *for Clergy and People*, any of what I may call the more spiritual Collects, such, for example, pre-eminently, as Trinity VI., VII., and XIX., or one of the Collects for Unity.

4. After the prayer For *all Conditions*, the special prayer from the Visitation Service for a person known to be near death.

5. Similarly, *In the Litany*, when said separately, to insert before the Prayer of St. Chrysostom, the Collect of the day, and one or more of the Collects of the Church, Trinity XV., XVI., XXII. and V., in that order, and the Accession Service Prayer for Unity, or else the Collect for Saints Simon and Jude's Day.

So much for insertion. Then in a week-day daily service, especially a double daily service, there is, I think, something to be said for the occasional substitution, in lieu of the invariable St. Chrysostom, of some other Collect suitable for the Epilogue or *l'ènvoi* of the service. Of these there are plenty, such as I., V., and VI. of the six Occasional Collects appended to the Communion Service. Of these, No. V. is especially beautiful, yet it is never heard in church. Then Epiphany I. and II., Good Friday II., and Trinity I., XII., and XXIII. In Lent the Collect, *O God, whose nature and property*, or the Commination Collect, would be very suitable in this position.

I suggest these insertions, and this one substitution, because I am sure that our services have been felt to be dull *because they were unvaried*, and there was no power, or at least, no practice, of suitable adaptation; which, of course, would be at discretion, according to time, season, place, or circumstance.

I hope and trust no one could now prosecute us, even under present circumstances, for these innocent and perfectly loyal variations. If they did I should immediately become personally unsafe.

Another serviceable adaptation I have found to be the recitation by alternate verses, in the absence of a daily choir, of a suitable hymn after the Third Collect. There is no earthly reason why we should not *say* a hymn, as well as a psalm, rather than have none at all; though a moderately musical parson might lead even a small daily congregation in singing it, even without accompaniment.

These suggested adaptations, *crede experto*, do really make all the difference between a dull, cold, formal and uninteresting service, and an edifying and refreshing one, the whole to be concluded in the short space of twenty minutes.

Just one more little suggestion of adaptation in our existing daily service as shortened. I don't see why, if we drop the Old Testament

Lesson at Evensong, we need therefore drop the *Magnificat*. Let it be said either immediately after the last psalm or, better, perhaps, after the New Testament Lesson, instead of *Nunc dimittis*, except on Wednesdays, Fridays, and other penitential days.

All this applies to ordinary days. On *Weekday Festivals* both lessons must be read with their Canticles; and when there is no celebration, and the full Ante-Communion would lengthen the service too much, a good plan is to read, after the Third Collect, with or without a hymn preceding or following, or both, the Epistle and Gospel, from the chancel-step, lectern, or pulpit, with a few words of comment, bringing out the teaching of the day as embodied in its special Scriptures, the reading of which this plan, which is applicable to either Matins or Evensong, secures in their entirety.

All this out of existing materials, involving only a freer use of them.

But for "modern needs" we want really, and have long wanted, a great deal more than this. We move dreadfully slowly; not quick enough, I am very sure, for our own safety. Still we are getting out of our dumb rigidity,; and, I hope, with accelerating rapidity. What we want, in the face of our dangers, and in the face of, what is much more to be considered, our manifest duties to the masses of the English nation, and the glorious work that lies before us amongst them, at home and abroad, is more love, more charity, more mutual confidence; less suspicion and "evil surmisings," less "biting and devouring," not, thank God, of "one another," but of one sort of Christians by another; more toleration of other Christians' ways, a bigger, grander conception of Christianity altogether. Then we might as a Church—and please God we will—develop rapidly new and varied services, fully adapted to all the large variety of modern needs; new agencies, new ministries, for the work of Him whom we all love, and for the blessing of the souls He died to save.

II. For instance, we might see our way, if we could only trust one another and be reasonable, to, what is so sorely needed, *an Authorised Appendix of Additional Collects and Prayers for various objects and occasions*, of which there are many which are not met by our existing Prayer Book stores. This is obviously the next step. Such Appendix to be bound up with our Prayer Books, with liberty to the minister to use its contents at discretion, by way of *addition to, not substitution for* (as a rule), our customary services. I love our Prayer Book as much as any man; but I have always had an honest dread of that dangerous and unimprovable state of mind, a mere Pharisaic optimism, either as regards the Prayer Book or our Church generally. We must own to a great many shortcomings, both in aim and in practice. What else is the meaning of the existing proportions of Dissent in this country? The Prayer Book is admirable, but it is not complete. It is so good that we want more, a good deal more, of the same sort. And there is plenty more where it came from; though I should never wish to restrict any desired additions to ancient sources only, for I am well assured that our Church has in our day abundant "treasures," out of which, for the spiritual sustenance of her children, she can "bring forth things new as well as old."

We want then, first, this *Authorised Appendix*. The Irish Church, amid heavy trials and almost overwhelming difficulties within and

without, has led the way, to some extent, in her Revised Prayer Book in respect to this improvment; and has provided some good additional prayers which we might well adopt by way of a beginning.

III. But I go further: We want not only our existing services somewhat varied and reinforced, but also *Additional Complete Services.*

This is practically acknowledged already by the Shortened Services Act, which permits the compilation of Additional Services from Prayer Book materials, to be approved by the Ordinary. The Appendix I have suggested would greatly help this process; for we have at present no special children's prayers, no authorised Harvest Thanksgiving prayers; nor, as the services put forth for the annual Day of Intercession abundantly prove, any suitable missionary prayers.

The most pressing wants I note here are these:—

1. A *Service for Children*, or rather Catechumens;
2. A *Harvest Thanksgiving Service*, fully authorised;
3. A *Service of Intercession for Missions*, which should surely include a Litany;
4. A special *Service for Good Friday afternoon;*
5. A special late *Service for New Year's Eve;*
6. *Services for Institution and Induction;*
7. Services of *Preparation for Holy Communion;*
8. An *Ember-week Service*, again with a special Litany;
9. A *Special Service of Intercession for Unity*, such as one lately printed by my dear friend the Vicar of Great Yarmouth.
10. An *Afternoon Service for Sundays*, such as one published in 1872 by the S.P.C.K.
11. A *Second Evensong* for churches that have two evening services on Sundays. The duplication of an identical service within a few hours is a bad thing spiritually, not for the congregation, which may be wholly different, but for the church officials, parson, clerk, choir, organist, etc., who, for the sake of all, as well as for their own sake, have a just claim to be considered.
12. A late Second Evensong suggests *Compline*, one of the most beautiful and thoroughly Scriptural services, as indeed they all are almost entirely, of the ancient Catholic times. We have the sweet *Nunc dimittis*, and the *Lighten our darkness* from it in our Evensong, into which *Compline* was compressed, by a like process to that which befel Matins, Lauds, and Prime, for the needs of a population which required for its Sunday supply, only two *Diets*, as our Scotch brethren would call them; and in our country districts, perhaps, the same may still suffice. But in all questions connected with church services it is always of the very first importance to remember that our Prayer Book and its forms, and many other church arrangements, were fixed at a time when the whole population scattered over the face of England was hardly more than the existing population of the one diocese of London. The change to what we have to deal with and provide for now is one that just makes all the difference; a change the mighty consequences of which, in more ways than one, our rulers in Church and State do not as yet show that they have sufficiently appreciated. And it is not a change merely in the direction of increasing numbers, and that in a frightfully accelerating ratio, but one that causes, or at least is accompanied by, a much more embarrassing variety of classes,

characters, and occupations, for the due provision for which in things spiritual the Church absolutely must have a largely increased liberty and elasticity in regard of the style, form, contents, length, ritual, number, and hours of her services.

Hence, while we do not wish or need to *alter* our existing services, we do need and wish greatly to *add to them.* We need for present use, both by clergy and people, some of those beautiful ancient forms of daily non-Eucharistic service which disappeared from the public Prayer Book in the necessary process of compression; but which, even then, were authoritatively retained, of course with all needful correction, which was really very little, for the use of the clergy or other devout persons in private.

We want the *late night service* for the chapels of our schools and colleges and religious communities, and the oratories of our clerical and other devout religious households. Its provision, on the lines of the ancient Compline, is really now well within the Act of Uniformity Amendment Act.

IV. And this leads me to another need in respect of any adaptation of our Church Services to current necessities. The substitution of the monthly for the old weekly *Recitation of the Psalter* is not all gain. There are many psalms which it is a serious loss not to use devotionally more than once a month. We want an *Authorised Table of Psalms*, not only such as the Bishop of Lincoln and others have already put out for use on special occasions as Proper Psalms, but also for more constant use, with due variation for days and seasons, in private, or at devotional meetings of the clergy or laity, and in religious communities, at Lauds for each day of the week, at Prime, at the three Day Hours, and at Compline. This again, if properly done, would ensure a very edifying and instructive variety, and a very valuable knowledge of the Psalter, for all those who had leisure and opportunity to use them. Let any clergyman who, with our lazy late habits, has to wait for his Sunday Matins until eleven o'clock, try the practice of saying the psalms of Sunday Lauds, in his church, if his house is next door to it, as it always ought to be, and he will find how blessed and strengthening it is, whether as preliminary to or in thanksgiving for an early celebration, or in preparation of his own soul, by thus joyfully sunning it in the presence of the ever blessed Trinity, before the ordinary public, and sometimes anxious and trying services of the day.

The Day Hours and Prime are also offices the authorised restoration of which is really needed in our day. The clergy want them for private use, our religious communities want them, and they are greatly needed for use at the meetings, whether of clergy or of lay people, for retreats and "quiet days," for which our existing Matins and Evensong do not sufficiently provide. Such restoration is well within the lines of Reformation principles, as any one may satisfy himself by looking at the Parker Society volume of "Private Prayers," put forth by authority in the reign of Elizabeth. The form of the old services is admirable, the substance for the most part Scriptural; but what I advocate is not an exact return to them, but the formation of services on their plan, but fuller and richer in the direction of fuller and more varied use of the psalms and Scripture short lessons, and also of our present far richer store of hymns.

The sense of this need led me some years ago to draw up services of this kind both in Latin and English. After testing by long use I offered the English Hours to the S.P.C.K., which entirely approved of them, but declined to print them, for commercial reasons.

Such services being entirely from Bible and Prayer Book materials, with the permitted exception of hymns, are entirely within the lines of the Shortened Services Act, and might be Episcopally authorised for use in church at special devotional meetings. Of course further prayers from such an Authorised Appendix as I have spoken of would greatly improve them.

V. Lastly, we want for modern needs, especially among our uninstructed masses, for use mostly in the evenings, whether in church, or in a school, or mission room, simple services, if you can call them services, which need no fixed or printed forms at all; services in which the clergyman should be absolutely free to do what he knows and feels would be most edifying and instructive to those to whom, on such occasions, he is ministering. Good hymns and metrical Litanies, well-selected Scriptures, simple, impressive, extempore preaching, should be the chief constituents of these services. As for prayers, the Prayer Book will supply a good deal that, with free liberty of careful selection, may be profitably used before or after the sermon, either at the faldstool, or in the reading desk, or pulpit. But, indeed, with or without these Prayer Book prayers I hope and believe there is no legal reason why, at such services as I am speaking of, we should not use, even in church, in the pulpit if not in the desk, specially composed prayers, or prayers altogether without book.

I append, with humble submission to the judgment of the Church and her Bishops, a tentative Table of Psalms for more frequent use, as suggested in Section V. of this paper.

PSALMS AT LAUDS.

Sunday, xciii., c., lxiii., lxvii., cxlviii., cxlix., cl. (The last three daily).
Monday, li., v., xxiii., xxiv.
Tuesday, li., xliii., xxvi., xxvii.
Wednesday, li., lxv., lxxxv., lxxxvii.
Thursday, li., xc., xlvii., xlviii.
Friday, li., cxliii., lxiii. ciii.
Saturday, li., xcii., lxiii., civ.

PSALMS AT PRIME.

Sundays and Festivals, liv., cxviii.
Advent, ix., x., xi.
Festal Seasons, viii., xix., xxiv.
Saints' Days, i., xv., xxxiv.
Ferial Days, cxix., 1–32.
Fridays, lix., lxiv., lxx.
Saturdays, xlii., xliii.

PSALMS AT THE THIRD HOUR.

Sundays and Festivals, xvi., lxxii., lxxxiv.
Advent, xii., xiii., xiv.
Ferial Days, cxix., 33–80.
Fridays, lxxxviii.
Saturdays, xlv., xlvi., xlviii.

PSALMS AT THE SIXTH HOUR.

Sundays and Festivals, xxi., xcvi., xcvii.
Advent, xvii., xxviii.
Ferial Days, cxix., 81–120.
Fridays, xxii.
Saturdays, cxxii., cxxiii., cxxvi.

PSALMS AT THE NINTH HOUR.

Sundays and Festivals, cx., xcviii., xcix.
Advent, xxxii., xxxv., xxxvi.
Ferial Days, cxix., 129–176.
Fridays, lxix.
Saturdays, cxxxii., cxxxiii., cxxxviii.

PSALMS AT COMPLINE.

Sundays and Festivals, cxlv., cxlvi., cxlvii.
Saints' Days, cxi., cxii., cxiii.
Advent, xxxi., xxxvii., lxxii.
Ferial Days, iv., xxxi., xci., cxxxiv.
Fridays, xvi., xxiii., cxxxix.
Saturdays, xxvi., xxvii., xxviii.

ADDRESSES.

The Rev. BERDMORE COMPTON, Vicar of All Saints', Margaret Street, London, W.

THE desirable additions to the Prayer Book have been so fully and admirably treated by Canon Medd that it remains for me to devote myself chiefly to the use of our services as we have them at present. There are two practical points to which I desire to direct your attention. One has been already adverted to—the divorce of the morning sermon on Sunday from the communion office, and its combination with matins. Having had some experience of this arrangement, I can strongly advocate it. The matins, as far as the end of the 3rd collect, with a sermon, makes a service of about an hour-and-a-quarter, which suits the needs of those who have already communicated at an earlier hour, and shortens to reasonable limits the mid-day choral communion office. The second point is the adaptation of a celebration about 9 o'clock on Sundays to a children's service. I did not introduce this in my own church of All Saints, and indeed should have regarded it *a priori* as of very doubtful prudence; but I found it already established, and did not discontinue it. It consists of what is called a *missa cantata*, with very simple ritual, several hymns sung by the children, and a short address of less than ten minutes' duration. After ten years' experience I am in a position to recommend it strongly; and it is useful for a class for whom it was not primarily intended, viz., the working men, who prefer it to the earlier and absolutely plain celebration, and also to the matins, and to the elaborate mid-day celebration. I venture to suggest this as an illustration of an important principle, viz., that our eucharistic service is not of so high a type as our matins and evensong. I mean that our order of holy communion does not rise to so high an expression and exhibition of eucharistic worship as our matins and evensong do of morning and evening devotion. Our communion services, therefore, are more suited than our matins and evensong to the popular and more superficial apprehension of children and working men.

I now pass to the more general subject of the principles of using our Prayer Book as a manual of Divine worship. Let me insist on the primary importance of dignity in the Church's worship. Worship is to please God, not to please man. The popularity of a system of worship is therefore wholly beside the mark. If anything, it is a bad symptom. The Church is at enmity with the world, and is never popular unless unworthily conformed to the world. If your worship is to be dignified, it must not be vulgar. No doubt vulgar people must be provided for, but they ought not to be accommodated and gratified by concession to their vulgarity. On the contrary, they should be raised out of it in their worship. Therefore let us be dignified—dignified in our gesture, both clergy and laity. It is not dignified in the clergy to recline in chairs at each end of the altar, presenting to the Church below the appearance of a figure mainly composed of legs. It is not dignified in a priest to genuflect or curtsey like a woman, instead of humbly kneeling or reverently bowing like a man and an Englishman, as he was directed to do in the old English use. It is not dignified in a layman to go down on all fours as an expression of adoration. Let us aim at dignity in our music. We properly like hearty singing in our congregational services, but services are often too "hearty," while many a choir would be greatly improved by expurgating at least half its members, whose harsh voices, even if they sing in tune, spoil the effect of the rest. Especially let me plead for dignity in the music of our choral celebrations. Haydn, Beethoven, Mozart, and Weber, provide plenty of material in their splendid masses, without having recourse to certain recent compositions,

which contain passages more proper as accompaniments to the "alarms and excursions" of Shakespeare's stage directions, than to the exalted mysteries of eucharistic worship. Let us have dignity in sermons. There is a rage for anecdotes in the pulpit, which are very difficult to tell with proper pulpit dignity. No doubt sermons should be refreshing as well as deep, but the necessary refreshment may be attained in a better way than by anecdote, viz., by so handling the subject as to make you see plainly a foot lower down than you ever saw before. I may venture to quote as a signal example of this excellent refreshing preaching, the sermons of the present Dean of St. Paul's. Let our reading the lessons be dignified, not exhibiting as an orator, much less as an actor, but narrating at second-hand. In reading, for example, St. Paul's speech at Antioch, it should be remembered that we are not taking St. Paul's words into our mouths, but St. Luke's. The words are the same, but we are giving our people, not our own report of them, but St. Luke's, and this involves a very different treatment of voice. Above all, let our praying be dignified in its unfeigned humility. If it is to be dignified it must be real and deep. Too often reality is lost by mannerism, such as the affectation of a voice broken with emotion, or whispered so as almost to sink into a continuous hissing. And depth is as certainly lost when the sentences are gabbled at railroad speed, unfailingly suggesting a superficial perfunctoriness, which is not respectful to our Master, and most undignified in His servant. One often wonders, when hearing very good men pray aloud in this manner, what amount of attention they are giving to individual ideas, so rapidly despatched? This element of dignity is pre-eminently necessary to the newer forms of services which Mr. Medd has enumerated, and which all of us desire. If the churches are to be used for them, as I heartily hope, we must have dignity in special children's services, dignity in guild or confraternity services, in mission services, in prayer meetings, in missionary services (for which our present Prayer Book gives us absolutely no help), in services of intercession for weather, or in time of sickness. And this naturally leads to the difficulty of using such services in our churches. The canonical regulation of the Church, embodied and enforced by the State in the Act of Uniformity, is very strict, and, as is inevitable in cases of such excessive strictness, there are various attempts at evasion. One theory is that you can do what you like in church, provided you have matins and evensong. And it must be conceded that this theory is favoured by the clause in the Act of Uniformity which relates to colleges and halls. There, says the Act, "no form or order of Common Prayer, etc., shall be openly used, other than that which is prescribed and appointed to be used in and by the said book." This may be argued to be an exceptional prohibition, and goes some way to negative a general prohibition in other places of worship than those of colleges and halls. A second idea is that the bishops have a sort of dispensing power, whereas, of course, they have no more power to break the law of the Church than the meanest of our laity have. It is a pity that the valuable time of our prelates should be occupied in telling their clergy so obvious a truth. But when men cannot evade a law which is felt to be over strict, they revolt against its bonds. And accordingly, from a very early period of the life of this law of Uniformity, we find attempts at "lawlessness" (to use a favourite word of our day). First comes royal lawlessness, displayed in such injunctions as that published and signed by "J. Russell," on June 21st, 1837, on the occasion of the accession of Her Most Gracious Majesty:—"Our will and pleasure is that the four forms of prayer and service made for the 5th of November, the 30th of January, the 29th of May, the 20th of June, be annexed to the book of Common Prayer, to be used," etc. What business has a minister of State to advise his mistress to do so lawless an action as annex other services to the Prayer Book, without the co-operation

of the Church, or even of Parliament; next comes archiepiscopal lawlessness, displayed in the recommendation from time to time of special prayers for public use on special occasions, such as that last one on the affairs of Egypt. But where is the line to be drawn, if an archbishop can impose one collect? why not impose a second volume of common prayer of wholly different character from the existing book—and is not this lawlessness? Then episcopal lawlessness, such as the introduction of addresses into the order of confirmation, which not only contains no provision for such addresses, but leaves no opening for them. No one has ever seen the order of confirmation in its due proportion and beauty until he has witnessed its administration without a "charge." Then the lawlessness of incumbents. I do not now allude to the honest observation of the rubrics, which is called lawlessness in Lord Penzance's domain, but such lawlessness as the neglect of daily services; celebrations maimed of the commandments; the observation of unauthorised octaves; and one of the most worrying of all lawless actions, the use of fancy collects, epistles, and gospels. I might go on to laymen's lawlessness in not sending their names previously to approaching the holy communion, not saying the responses, etc., etc. All this lawlessness, royal, archiepiscopal, episcopal, sacerdotal, lay, can only be justified on the theory that the Prayer Book lays down a minimum, not a maximum; a theory, any approach to which has been vigorously repudiated by the opponents of catholic ritual, but which no one who knows the history of the reformation can fail to admit as greatly worthy of consideration.

But now what is to be done in this tangle of strictness, evasion, and "lawlessness?" There is one thing which seems hopeless, viz., that the Church should go to Parliament (as it went in 1871 and 1872), for a further relaxation of the bonds of uniformity than was conceded in the Prayer Book (Tables of Lessons) Act, 1871, and in the Act of Uniformity Amendment Act, 1872, respectively. In his evidence before the Ecclesiastical Courts Commission, Mr. Bouverie tells us that when one of these bills was introduced into Parliament, it contained a recital of the approval of the Convocation. He tells us that at the instigation of the late Dean Stanley, he persuaded the House to strike out that recital, and it was struck out, and does not appear in the Act, though it appears in the Act of Uniformity of 1662. This can only mean that Parliament will not admit any authority of the Church to take part in legislation for the Church. It is hardly admitted even (as you may see in Mr. Bouverie's evidence) that the fact of the consent of Convocation would not be a positive objection to the adoption of a measure by Parliament. In this state of things let us have no Parliamentary legislation at all in things spiritual, except simply to undo what Parliament has done without the Church. Better go on as we are with our strictness, evasions, and "lawlessness," than submit the Church to the insult of being directed in spiritual things by a secular body.

Lastly, let me put before you a very serious question, underlying all considerations of the use of the Prayer Book. Who is responsible for such discretionary use as we do enjoy? and the determination of this question will reach much further than the present subject. Who is responsible before God? Who will have to answer in the day of judgment for the effect of any discretion on the souls of the people of a parish? The bishop or the incumbent? One thing is clear, that whoever is responsible ought to be free to do what he thinks right, inside the law of the Church. We incumbents would be glad indeed to think that the bishops were responsible, and not ourselves. If the bishop is responsible, he ought to be able to remove an incumbent who does not do what he wishes and directs. But if we are responsible (as is certainly the usual opinion), much as we must value the bishop's advice and opinion, we cannot adopt it, except by making it our own. We have no right to tell our people, "The

bishop tells me to do this. I do it, but I do not think it right. It is not in accordance with my own deliberate opinion;" for we shall have no right to plead it in the Great Day. The answer is inevitable—"It was your responsibility, and you had no power to shuffle out of it, or renounce it!" Is, then, the incumbent responsible for the conduct of public service in matter, and in ritual? If so, he ought to do nothing but what he believes in his heart to be right. The ancient words of institution look like it—"*Accipe meam curam et tuam.*" Do these words spoken by the bishop divest him of his responsibility, or is it a divided responsibility? If the latter, the dividing limits should be definite and known, both to bishop and incumbent. At present, if they exist, they certainly are not either definite or known.

Sydney Gedge, Esq., Mitcham, Surrey.

Approaching this subject from a layman's point of view, and being somewhat of a Low Churchman, I expected to find in the speeches of my reverend predecessors several points on which I should differ from them. It gives me pleasure that on one important point only are my views at variance with theirs. Each of them has, in terms more or less severe, commented upon the clergymen in whose churches there is not daily service, and Canon Medd quoted, without disapproval, the remark made upon such a clergyman that "he has nothing to do in the week, and does it." Is constant visiting of the sick nothing? Is frequent going in and out amongst the poor nothing? Is giving religious instruction in the schools and in Bible-classes, for young people and for men and women, nothing? Is the preparation of sermons nothing? I maintain that those clergymen who devote their time to these and other ministerial duties, but do not have daily services because they find them unattended, are at least as distinguished for hard work in their parishes, as any of the clergy who give up an hour and a half a day to the conduct of daily service. The Prayer Book does not require daily service if there be good reason to the contrary and the ordinary approves, and it should be remembered that when the Church laid down the rule, family prayers were almost unknown. Now we find family prayers in nearly every Christian family; and they may be said to take the place, to a great extent, of the former daily service in the Church. Like those who have spoken before me, I heartily rejoice in the change with regard to public worship from the time when dullness was taken for devotion, slowness was considered essential to solemnity, and, worst of all, slovenliness was mistaken for spirituality. In considering what other changes should be made to adapt our services to modern wants, we must set before us the objects for which Divine service is held. First, it is held for the worship and praise of God; second, it is for prayer for ourselves and for the Church at large; third, it is for the edification of Saints; and, fourth, for the conversion of sinners. With regard to the first, Mr. Compton laid great stress upon the service being dignified. The Church of England has been said to be dying of dignity. To my mind, while the service should undoubtedly be worthy of all its objects, humility, rather than dignity, is the attitude with which we should "worship in spirit and in truth" God, who is "greatly to be feared in the assembly of the Saints." It is essential to the attainment of all the objects of Divine worship that the services should be conducted in a manner, as well as in a language, "understanded of the people." The vulgar tongue is not enough. There must be good and articulate reading, loud enough to be heard, without difficulty, throughout the church. A change of voice is desirable, and it is well that the lessons should be read by laymen, if they can read.

It is good to see Mr. Gladstone consecrating his melodious voice and great power of elocution to God's service, in reading the lessons. It is not good that two young lads should come forward from the choir, merely because they wear surplices, and read the lessons, either in a shy nervous way, so that they can scarcely be heard, or in the monotone of a school-boy reciting a task. They should be so read as to arouse and keep the attention of every person in the church. Naturally, therefore, I object to intoning. It seems to me unnatural. What child, earnestly desiring pardon from his father, what courtier, anxious to obtain a post from a minister of state, would sing out his petition on a note? But of intonation—a very different thing from intoning—there should be due variety. So much for the portion of the service to which the congregation listen. Next, as to that in which they take a part. We congratulated ourselves, some years ago, on getting rid of the one parish clerk, but in most churches we have made a bad exchange of this one for twenty or thirty men and boys, who say or sing the responses at the top of their voices, and effectually prevent any one else from joining, while the organ rumbles an accompaniment. I do not object to plenty of chanting; but let the chants be such that the people can join in them, and not services like anthems, with arrangements for solos, duetts, and quartetts, which look too much as if they were performed to the honour and glory of the choir. If the Church be thus turned into a concert-room, the congregation might well mark their sense of it by adopting the position of the concert-room and sit down, instead of standing, to hear singing in which they are not permitted to take part. In short, the service should be congregational, and every one present should join in voice, as well as heart, instead of hearing it performed for him by proxy in the chancel. To mention one small practical point—combine with the new plan of reading the text, in giving out the hymn, the old fashioned one of giving the first line, so that people who do not hear the number (often indistinctly given), may be able to find it. I come next to the last point of my subject, which has not been dealt with by preceding speakers, although it is the most important part of the service. I mean the sermon. It is all very well for you ladies and gentlemen to dissent from this proposition. You have your bibles and commentaries and many religious books, but to five-sixths of the congregation attending our churches, the Sunday sermon supplies the only religious instruction and education that they ever get. The other part of the service gives the worship and praise of God and prayer, but to "preach the word" is the Divinely appointed means of edifying the saints and converting sinners. Yet preaching has been much neglected of late years. Sermons have been cut down to a minimum to make time for musical services. As Pope says:—

"Many to church repair
"Not for the doctrine, but the music there."

And the result is that clergy too often preach as if they knew that they must say something for a few minutes, rather than because they have something to say, some message from God to deliver. No wonder then that the question, "What was the sermon about?" is answered by the reply, "About a quarter of an hour," or that lazy indifference is the attitude with which sermons are generally regarded by the congregation. And I read the other day, turning over the pages of "Once a Week," an article, the writer of which stated that he could not remember a single word of any sermon he had ever heard. Surely the right course with sermons, as with speeches or lectures on other subjects, is for the preacher to master his subject, think it out, and make up his mind what he has to say upon it, and then to say it in the best language of which he is capable, regardless whether his sermon lasts fifteen or twenty minutes, or three-quarters of an hour, or longer. I will venture to draw

upon my own experience as a licensed preacher in the Diocese of Rochester, having during the last six years conducted about 250 services, and preached as many times to audiences, varying in numbers from 25 in a school-room to 3,000 in the Victoria Music Hall. Most of the clergy probably in this room can preach far better than I can, but these audiences have listened to me and to others (some of whom, perhaps, preach worse than I do) for the length of time I have described, without apparent weariness, and certainly without leaving the room, which they were at liberty to do at any time; but they had not been wearied by a long service beforehand. But even with that long service my school-fellows and I, many years ago, used to listen with rapt attention to the late Dr. Miller for an hour, and even an hour-and-a-half on Sunday evenings. "Praying," says George Herbert, "is the end of preaching," and if he meant that the best result of a sermon is to bring the listeners to their knees, I quite agree with him. Few things have filled me with more sorrow and anxiety than when I look round upon a large congregation, especially on a Sunday evening, and hear some clergyman get through his sermon as if he were only considering how soon it would come to an end. A preacher must be able to speak from his own experience of religion, to say, not "Go to Christ," but "Come to Christ," for I have come to Him, and know the happiness of doing so; take the armour of God, for I have proved it, and know its power against the assaults of the foe. He should remember that those whom he is addressing are "hungry for the bread of life," and that he should be a messenger of grace to sinful men, and like Richard Baxter say, "I preached as I ne'er should preach again: and as a dying man to dying men." Then he need not fear that their attention will flag, and at the close of his Gospel discourse, the whole congregation will be ready to join in that prayer which, as Canon Medd truly said, we unfortunately rarely hear now, "Grant, we beseech Thee, Almighty God, that the words which we have heard this day with our outward ears may through Thy Grace be so grafted inwardly in our hearts that they may bring forth in us the fruit of good living to the honour and praise of Thy Name through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen."

DISCUSSION.

The Right Hon. A. J. B. Beresford Hope, M.P.

When I sent my in card, I did so with the intention of pointing out the real scope and benefits of the Acts of Parliament to which reference has already been made, and I wanted especially to dwell on the new and advantageous position the Church is now in as the result of that recent legislation. These matters have already been ably dealt with by the Bishop of Bedford and Canon Medd, so that I shall now content myself with one or two explanatory remarks. To start with a paradox, I think that processional hymns are sometimes too long, and that the initiatory sentences used immediately afterwards, strikes the congregation as coming in rather oddly. Now why should not the initiatory sentences be set to music as anthems, those of a more jubilant character being for festive seasons, and the more penitential ones for occasions when such were most appropriate? But I pass from that to make a suggestion. Canon Medd dwelt upon the disadvantages of the monthly arrangement of the Psalms, but has he ever thought out the liberty given by the new Lectionary Act, to provide particular Psalms? That Act ought always to be read as one with the Shortened Services Act, and it will then be seen how powerful is the machinery which they provide. I really think that it is the fault of the bishops and clergy if the Psalter of the Church of England is not freely and doctrinally used under that Act. Next I would go to the Shortened Service Act, and I find that complaints are made that the services allowed by it are limited to words from the Bible and Prayer-book. That is true, and is, I admit, a theoretical complaint, and, looking at the matter as a practical man, I do not

see how more liberty could have been given at the time the Act was passed. What would have been the consequences if too much liberty had been given to the captive, too much light poured upon the blinded eye? If twelve years ago, when the Act was passed, it had gone beyond its provisions, it would have opened the door to all sorts of strange caprices, and considerable danger might have ensued. You will, no doubt, say, Why do not you bring in an amending Act? I wish we could. I could tell you some amusing stories, if it were expedient, as to the way in which ecclesiastical legislation is done in the House of Commons. There is no chance now of legislation favourable to the wishes of the Church, but I believe enough advantage has not been taken of what legislation we have already. The clergy have not exercised enough ingenuity and cleverness in compiling services within the provisions of this Act, and surely much might be done in making collects and prayers, versicles and responses out of texts, which, of course, would be extracts from the Scriptures. The cleverest services of this sort are two for Good Friday, the "Seven Words" and the "Three Hours," but then they are not original, for we found those ready to hand in older service books. The same sort of cleverness might, I feel sure, be used by our own generation in other directions, and a great deal more might be done than has yet been done, and without going back, except in this roundabout way, on the old sacramentaries, the loss of which, however, is to be deplored. We must also remember that these restrictions only apply to churches, but there are many places which may be made to look uncommonly like churches in their furniture and arrangements, but which legally are only oratories or rooms fitted up for prayer. In those rooms you may use any amount of services in themselves consistent with the Church of England, without falling within the clutches of the law. Of course, such services must be used with caution, and under the direction and sanction of your ecclesiastical superiors. There are liberty and elasticity and development to be found in the changes of the last few years, and it only wants a little more ingenuity, cleverness, courage, and quickness of mind to discover how the recent Acts can be applied to secure these results. I believe that the day of the Church legislation has passed away for the present—we are at this moment in the night of the Church legislation, but do not be downhearted thereat. It is the call to us to make the best use of our present resources, having always respect to Catholic antiquity, and to the existing Church laws.

The Rev. R. B. GIRDLESTONE, Hon. Canon of Christ Church, and Principal of Wycliffe Hall, Oxford.

THE first thing I wish to say is that every person who comes to the Church should have a Prayer Book, and having a Prayer Book should be taught how to use it. I should like to see a system adopted by which the children in every parish school should be taught the use of the Prayer Book. What a history it has! The "Teacher's Prayer Book," published by Canon Barry, is one for which we are much indebted, and which I hope will be generally read. Again, the clergyman in visiting his people might ask them if they were in the habit of bringing their Prayer Books to church, and might explain to them how to find their places. The people should be recommended to use their Prayer Books for their private devotions. This point is admirably worked out by Dean Burgon in one of the volumes of lectures delivered at St. James's, Piccadilly. People should be taught that prayer and worship are not the same thing. What a wonderful word is worship. It suggests the idea of the prostration of the creature before his Creator. We ought in these times to help people to feel their responsibility towards their Creator, and to encourage in them the spirit of reverence and worship, which seems to be dying out among many. Then I think that our informal services ought to be regarded as feeders for our regular services. I do not see why we should not have an extempore prayer in one part of a mission service, and invite all the people to join us in the general confession a little further on; that would prepare them for the Church service. The points hitherto noticed may be regarded as preliminary matters; but now let us enter the church—and here what we need is discrimination in the conducting of the services. Some young clergymen seem to think it a reproach to have only to read the prayers. I would ask them, however, to think what a grand thing it is to lead the devotions and worship of the

people in the presence of the living God. We must not forget that the Prayer Book is most varied in its contents, and the minister should, as far as possible, realise the spirit of each part as he proceeds. How often does one hear the parson mumbling the words, "Dearly beloved brethren," instead of speaking out to the congregation face to face. It is unfortunate that our service always begins with these words. I do not see why these three words should not be occasionally dropped. A few slight modifications in the conduct of the service would not bring the anathemas of the Church on our heads. I like to see people read the lessons with the clergyman, I like a *bona fide* Prayer Book, and a *bona fide* Bible; and I should like to get rid of the so-called "Church Services." Again, in giving out the lessons, the clergyman should make a sufficient pause, to give people time to find their places. We have heard a good deal about laymen reading the lessons, but the real point is that the lessons should be read well, whether by layman or parson. Dean Hook not unfrequently, when he finished reading the lesson, would say, "And a very good lesson it is." Dealing with the subject of lessons, I think we might bring them a little more forward in the service, and we might revert to the custom of making a brief explanation of the lessons immediately after reading them, and the same thing might be done with regard to the Psalms. I sometimes think we read too many of the Psalms rather than too few. It would be well to have a selection of them carefully chosen out for public service, with a few words of explanation now and then at the end, as the Psalms are perhaps the hardest part of the Bible to understand. Again, we ought to use special prayers and thanksgivings more frequently than we do, instead of only using them in cases of illness. Another thing I would say is, that we do not strike when the iron is hot. Perhaps a stirring sermon has been given, but directly it is over the organ strikes up a jig, and the people go away without the least attempt on the part of the clergy to enforce what they have heard by a few kind words to individuals. I believe that if the minister would only go among the people after the service, he would be able to do much by a few hearty, loving words, towards leading them to Christ.

The Rev. Canon George Venables, Vicar of Great Yarmouth and Rural Dean of Flegg.

It has done me a power of good, Mr. Chairman—as they term it in grand old Yorkshire—it has done me a power of good to listen to the admirable papers which have been read to us, one by the excellent and observant Bishop of Bedford, and the other by that distinguished member of the University of Oxford, Canon Medd. With very much also that has been uttered by succeeding speakers I am in great accord; and, for the moment at least, I feel inclined to take hope that, at last, the time is coming when something will be done. I will confess that for some years past I have been saddened, and almost soured sometimes, as I have seen the pressing needs of the population, the opportunities for the Church to supply those needs, and these opportunities frittered away. It is now getting nigh to a quarter of a century ago, when, at the first Church Congress held at Cambridge, I just hinted at our needs, notably at Manchester, a few years later, described them; again, at Wolverhampton, repeated my longings to see them supplied, and finally last year at Derby I urged the manifest importance of the Church giving due attention to the now undoubted necessities of the people. All has seemed hitherto fruitless, and in vain. To-night, however, there are symptoms of a better state of feeling, but I forewarn you that adaptation alone will by no means secure all we require. Something has been said, too, about finding their places in the Prayer Book. I have watched the proceedings of very many congregations, and believe that in our average congregations not more than one third of the people take an active part in the responsive worship of the Church. But why not? Ah! the reason is that which causes thousands upon thousands never to enter church at all. Men are ashamed to stand book in hand, but unable to know how to use the book, and prefer by thousands to go where, as they say (most unhappy is the thought), all is done for them. Now this serious evil could be removed to-morrow, but my method for doing it is so simple that I fear our great publishers and great societies look askance at it. The cotton famine opened my eyes very widely to the needs of popularising the Prayer Book, and forced me to devise a remedy in the

matter of finding the places in it many years ago. In the end, I induced the S.P.C.K. to print a Prayer Book with every page numbered, and by this means it has been found easy enough to announce the page, and so find the place. But presently the S.P.C.K. printed many more editions and sizes of the Prayer Book with the pages numbered, and new editions of the original slightly altered; so that, now, what is on page 18 in one edition is on page 19 in another, and on page 12, or 23, or 30 in another! Thus the paging plan has been simply rendered useless by not adhering to one stereotyped edition. But, notwithstanding, I have another method, specimens of which some of this assembly have seen, and by which I will undertake to-morrow, if this hall were as full as it now is, but with men who, while they can read, have never seen a Prayer Book before, to enable every one of them to take a reverent earnest part in the worship, and without any difficulty whatever. Why refuse to do, when necessary, the same simple thing with prayers which you do not hesitate to do with your praises? And it would require to be done but seldom, though I know that the results would be most satisfactory. I know, for I have tried the plan, and so have others, with complete success. Well, then, adaptation also, such as sketched out in those admirable papers, would do great good, and let us have it, only this will by no means suffice to meet all our needs. And, moreover, I must plead that our two hundred and eighty collects, or whatever be their number, may not be treated like so many bells out of which changes may be rung by myriads, or as so many mosaics to be put together as puzzles, but that we may treat them somewhat in accordance with the intention for which they were written, and not force them to do duty on every novel occasion when prayers are wanted. There is a deep and rich mine, well stored with precious prayers, in which the Church may dig and find much that she needs, and we ought thankfully to use it. But I do not believe that the Holy Ghost has forgotten His promise to pour out upon His Church the spirit of supplication, and to teach us still to pray. I am sure that new prayers ought to be produced sometimes for the new occasion, and I believe those prayers can be produced. Why, only yesterday we had a proof of this at the meeting upon Purity, and the beginning of Congress was almost ushered in by a prayer for the Church Convention in America. Each prayer was a sufficient proof that the Church can produce new prayers when needed, although I have not the slightest idea who compiled or composed the two prayers to which I refer. And do not too readily deprive any new service of a short lesson from the Old Testament, as well as from the New Testament also. And then, when you have done all these things, you have not by any means done enough. Why is not lay agency more fully and heartily recognised, encouraged, and directed than it is? Why are the laymen who are willing to labour still left unprovided with a Book of Offices specially fitted for them and the outside mission work which they long to do? It has often puzzled me, and of late it has much distressed me, that the bishops have done nothing in this matter. I will speak it openly, that I do think they ought long since to have taken action in this particular, and I should like to tell Convocation that it has been, and is, very greatly to blame as well. Oh! if only these things had been but attended to heartily a few years ago, how many troubles might have been averted, how much good might have been effected! Many of those well-meant but often distressingly misguided efforts of the past few years, and of the present moment also, might have been wholly averted if the Church had both adapted her services within Church and adopted many services besides. I should be very sorry to introduce any controversy into this assembly, but I do hope that one of the speakers to-night will bear with me in telling him that I deem him as not wholly accurate in his views concerning singing or monotoning our prayers and supplications. It will be seen upon examination that not a few of the Psalms contain a much greater amount of prayer than of praise, and that one or two of them have scarcely one word of praise at all. And yet these Psalms have musical notations, and were handed over to some chief musician for the very purpose that they might be set to music. Or take the last chapter of the Book of Habakkuk. It is a gloomy though most lovely chapter, full of the most terrible forebodings, yet ever showing confidence in God; and it is termed "A prayer of Habakkuk." But how does it conclude? With the words, "To the chief singer on my stringed instruments." These things are conclusive, and it is a mistake to suppose that prayers may not be sung. The bell warns me that I have but two or three more minutes, but that is abundance to enable me to ask a question which, though cheered and encouraged to-night, I fear will still take a long time to find its answer. I ask, then—how long ere these things be done? After another quarter of a century has passed, and the mischief they might now avert has increased still further? after I and many here shall have passed to our quiet graves, and with us tens of thousands of our fellow-countrymen, neglected and uncared for, who

might still be rescued? If we claim to be Catholic, let us prove our Catholicity by meeting all the reasonable necessities of our fellow-men in things religious. But, Oh! again I ask, When, when, shall these things be done?

The Right Hon. the Earl Nelson.

I especially want to allude to the adaptation of our services to the modern needs of the Church, and to show how necessary those needs really are. The most pressing needs are those to which allusion has been made. I mean with reference to those people who are, without doubt, outside the Church's ordinary services. Such people want educating up to the services in the Church; and I should like to see shortened services, licensed by the bishop, in every diocese, such as would be suitable for the masses of our people. It is a mistake to think that the people outside the Church will readily be got to attend the full services in the Church. They must be first got into mission halls, and such places. I should like to see a mission room or chapel in every parish. It is a mistake that the mission services are likely to alienate the people from the Church. I can quote many cases in which hundreds of communicants have been brought to early Communion in the parish church from these mission chapels. On the other hand, we have no service suitable for these places, and that is a hindrance. When we have an alienated people, and the growth of agnosticism and infidelity around us, it is of great importance that the Church should meet that state of things with a united front; and I believe nothing would do more to restore to us the most earnest men of the Nonconformist ranks than to have services adapted to the masses in mission chapels, and regularly organised lay ministrations. I am certain that if something of that sort were done, the Church would gain a predominance, and the masses of the people would be brought back into the Church. A great deal more could be done under the Shortened Service Acts than is done. I know one instance in which a shortened service was gladly welcomed by Nonconformists. The Rev. Child Clarke has drawn up various services—they are taken from the Scriptures and the Prayer Book—for all the great festivals of the Church, for harvest festivals, and for children's services; also, following the practice of many Nonconformist bodies, a "Service of Song" for Good Friday. I rejoiced to hear that on last Good Friday the Wesleyans of Exeter advertised Mr. Child Clarke's Service of Song, licensed as it is by the bishop of the diocese, for that day. It is a great fact that such a service, clearly meeting the wants of that section of the Nonconformists, should have been provided by the Church. If only the bishops will encourage this sort of thing, it will be a witness to the world that we are anxious to meet the wishes of the people, and of our Nonconformist brethren.

The Rev. W. Carlile, of the Church Army.

You are aware that the object of the Church Army is to provide daily services for the people. It is not a mission, but it provides daily services at such places where the poorest of the poor will go. We feel they ought to be provided with something of the sort. It has been my lot to work in many poor parishes; and we have had to go into small mission halls, situated in obscure corners, and often had great difficulty in even getting such places, while the parish church often has its doors closed all the week. This evening I have to plead for the masses of the people. I spend my life in the streets, and I plead for the unchurched masses, and ask why something more cannot be done on the week-days for the purpose of winning those outside lost ones. We spend our time trying to get people into out of the way schoolrooms and mission halls, and it is often very hard to get them in, and even then the accommodation is so bare that if they sit for half an hour on the forms they get uncomfortable, while there is God's house close by, but not available to us. Some people say the schoolroom is the proper place to get these people into; but my experience is quite the opposite, and I find that if we only will run the risk of getting our clothes soiled a little in reaching them, the poorest people will follow us into the churches. I would also like the liberty to adapt the service more to the wants of our people, and use

the opportunity of some few words of testimony. I remember on one ocasion, after the evening service, inviting those who were willing to "confess Jesus as Lord" with the mouth, to stand, and about forty, in a quiet and unostentatious way, gave their trembling testimony for Christ. Owing to the force of these witnesses, no less than twenty-one men and women at my invitation went and knelt at the altar rails, expressing real contrition and repentance. Some of these are useful helpers in the work, and now that four months have passed, many of those who found peace with God *in the Church* are most regular communicants, and soldiers in the Church Army.

The Rev. SIDNEY PHILLIPS, Rector of Nuneham Courtenay, Oxon.

I SHOULD not have ventured to send in my card, were it not that I have two practical suggestions to make, which may be of some little value. They were made to me by a friend, who is one of the most successful Missioners in the Church of England, and I have found from experience that they are thoroughly practical, and likely to be productive of much good wherever they are adopted. But, first of all, let me say that when I advocate services of a more elastic character than we are many of us accustomed to, I feel most strongly that we must not in any way relax the Church's rule of saying the daily Offices appointed for us in the Prayer Book. We, the clergy, are bound to say the daily Offices morning and evening, they are essential for our spiritual life ; and, further, I do think that we ought to try, even in very small country parishes, to give our people increased opportunities of receiving the Holy Communion. In the very small parish, for instance, of which I now have the charge, I have found it quite practicable to have celebrations on Thursdays and holy days, as well as upon Sundays, and it has very seldom happened that there have not been "three at the least," found ready to communicate. I would go further still, and say that I do not think we should rest content until we have established a daily celebration of Holy Communion in our churches. This should be our aim in every parish. The subject of daily Communion is, I venture to think, one which might well be discussed at some future Church Congress ; there is much, very much, to be said in its favour. Any one who will take the trouble to study the subject will probably be surprised to find how often and how strongly daily Communion has been advocated by our Anglo-Catholic divines during the last three centuries, as well as in primitive times, and by the Fathers of the Church. But time will not permit me to say more. I can only mention the two points to which I am anxious to draw your attention, and I shall be obliged to sit down. The first is that, during the seasons of Advent and Lent it has been found to be a good plan, in parishes where the experiment has been fairly tried, to say Evensong on Sunday afternoon, and in the evening to hold regular mission services ; at these mission services popular hymns, in which all the congregation can easily join, should be used ; a stirring sermon preached, and an after meeting held, at which we should try to make our people realise with us that we have sinned grievously in the sight of God, as we kneel with them in His presence, and ask for mercy. The other point is this, we should try to bring our people together for united intercession and prayer. At the Leeds mission in January of this year (and in many other places the same plan has been adopted), persons attending the mission services were invited to write down subjects for intercession, and leave them in a box or basket placed in the church for the purpose. On the following morning all the subjects for special intercession were publicly offered in the church, and I am sure that all persons who joined in the service felt that these special petitions gave an unusual reality to their prayers. I regret that I am prevented by the bell from adding more on the subject.

JAMES PARKER, Esq., Oxford.

THE Bishop of Bedford, in his admirable paper, has said we want greater powers to adapt the services of the Church to the needs of the people, and Canon Venables has asked why should we not have such powers? Now, I believe we

are too much afraid of the Act of Uniformity. What is the Act of Uniformity? There is first the Act itself, and next a schedule, and that schedule is the Prayer Book, which, because it has the same force as the Act, people naturally confuse with the Act itself. The terms, however, of the Act are drawn up by lawyers and are in the usual form observed in those documents, each word and sentence having a definite and so limited meaning, or, if it has not it is the duty of the lawyers to give it a definite meaning in consonance with other acts. But the Prayer Book was written on other lines, and not by lawyers, and so we are bound rather to act up to its principles than to its letter. Suppose, then, we do not act according to the exact or the mere letter, who will interfere. The bishop, so long as he finds his clergy loyally obedient to the principles of the Book, will not prosecute unless he is obliged to do so by pressure of the churchwardens and parishioners; and this has seldom, if ever, been the case; or, else, unless some society external to the parish set the courts in motion; and, now that the Commissioners' Report has been issued, we may hope that for the future we shall hear much less of a certain society, which has done so much to hinder the extension and variation of our services, than we have of late years, if, indeed, we hear of it at all. I believe, therefore, that, under present circumstances, many of the clergy might at once, and with impunity, adapt the services more to the special needs of some parishes than they do. We must, it is true, have uniformity in the great principles embodied in the Prayer Book, but this need not prevent our allowing details to vary according to various wants. Indeed, so long as in our variations we keep to the lines on which the Prayer Book was compiled, namely, those of the doctrines and practices of the early Church, we shall attain a greater conformity to the main principles of the Prayer Book than we shall lose in uniformity in mere detail. If we have special needs, and with increase of spheres of work, it is certain that we have such needs, then, so long as we follow those lines in a loyal obedience to the spirit of the Prayer Book, we cannot do wrong in supplying those needs, and should not refrain from mere dread of a misintrepretation by lawyers of the schedule to the Act of Parliament. I believe that in this present awakening of the Church we want greater variety and more earnestness, and more definite expression of doctrine in our services. But for the changes or extensions required to these ends, we need not wait for any new Acts of Parliament to help us, and, therefore, in reply to Canon Venable's question, "When shall we have this power?" I think the answer is, "We have it now, if it be used wisely."

The Rev. J. Harry Buchanan, Priest in Charge of Holy Trinity, Ilkeston.

I hope that the day will never come when family prayer will take the place of daily service, as seemed to be suggested by one of the speakers. In a small country parish of a population of 300, I myself have never missed daily service for five years, except in case of illness, or as the Prayer Book provides, for "other urgent cause;" and to ask me to substitute something else which is purely voluntary, is most unreasonable. I want the Church to go to work on the masses, and people think we ought to take a lesson in this sphere of our work from the Salvation Army. I deny that we can learn anything from the Salvation Army, for everything that the Army has, which is good, they themselves learnt from the Church. Father Lowder came before "General" Booth. Father Lowder knew how to work amongst the masses without indecency of worship. We must use continual and frequent out-door services, and at all places and all times, with any amount of orderly and attractive ceremonial. This mode of reaching the masses is an urgent work, and it is one that we must do. I would extend the number of mission rooms, for there are many who will come to a mission room, but not to the Church; and some people will listen to a layman, who are prejudiced against a parson. We must vary our services, and make use of laymen much more than hitherto has been done, and then we shall find that the Church will readily adapt herself to every class in this country.

CONGRESS HALL,

FRIDAY MORNING, OCTOBER 5TH.

The Right Rev. the PRESIDENT in the Chair.

PERSONAL RELIGION.

The Right Rev. the PRESIDENT.

OUR subject this morning is "Personal Religion," and I must tell you that there are some changes unfortunately in the list of those who have to speak to you. One name, by some accident, has not been printed in many of the programmes—the Rev. Herbert James, who kindly consented at the request of myself and of the committee, to address you some time ago. Another name, which does appear on the programme, I am sorry to say, you must remove. We can, however, but rejoice that Canon Cadman has duties which call him to Canterbury. Canon Hoare has very kindly consented to take his place. With regard to the conduct of the proceedings this morning, I may remind those who have attended former Congresses, and inform those who have not, that it has been the practice for many years past, to conduct this meeting upon a different plan from that which is adopted in respect of others, and it has been usual to abstain from all expressions of approval and disapproval during the course of it. One reason, of course, for this is, that the subjects which are treated being such as to require great reverence in handling them, it would rather destroy that feeling if there were any manisfestations of approval or disapproval. And I think I should also add, that of course the meaning of it is that no one is committed to any statement made by any speaker or reader: for instance, it is not to be considered that because he does not manifest his disapproval, he is any way committed by his silence. I now ask for your earnest and thoughtful attention to those who are to speak.

PAPERS.

The Rev. E. KING, D.D., Canon of Christ Church, Regius Professor of Pastoral Theology, Oxford.

I HAVE assumed that a paper on the "Spiritual Life" at a Church Congress is not required to state the foundations of the faith, nor to deal primarily with the errors by which those foundations are assailed; and, further, that the cautions and balancing considerations which are required by any short statement on religion need not be expressed. In

short, I have assumed that the object of this paper is to call attention from year to year to one or two points in which the spiritual life of the day appears to the writer to need attention, in order that it may be by God's help raised still higher on the old foundations.

The first suggestions I have to offer are with regard to our relation to faith. In this day of experimental philosophy, when the discoveries in the different branches of physical science are so real, so attractive, so wonderful, so largely beneficial to mankind, we are in danger of supposing that everything that is beautiful, and good, and true, is the result of our own discovery, and is discoverable by the same faculties—we need reminding that we have different sets of faculties. The hand, the eye, and the reason; the heart, the affections, and the will—all have their special work to do in obtaining truth. No improvement in the microscope will enable us to distinguish between good and bad men, no improvement in the telescope will enable us to see God. The mother at her cottage-door, the farm lad following the plough, the mill girl working at her loom, may all have this knowledge if they have the instrument required—a pure heart. "Blessed are the pure in heart, for they shall see God." We need then more care to preserve *proportion* in the culture of our faculties. We need to "exercise ourselves unto godliness;" we need *spiritual* exercises as well as exercises for the body and the mind—there are difficulties which cannot be overcome except by "prayer and fasting."

Again, do we not need to consider faith on the side of *acceptance?* This is an age of discovery, an age of discovery of great blessings to mankind, and we are easily led to suppose that we can find out religion for ourselves. This is an age also of freedom, of religious as well as civil liberty. We *are* free, indeed, as far as our will is concerned, but we forget that this freedom does *not* imply our *independence*. We cannot get on without help, help from others; children need someone to take care of them, the arts and sciences need schools and professors. We cannot reach the intended perfection of our capacities without assistance from without. It is the same with faith. We cannot believe by the mere exertion of our own faculties; we need help from without, help from above, help from God. The Eastern world has rather lost itself than found God, the Hindoo in absorption, the Buddhist in extinction—*Nirvana.* The old Western world felt after God, but could not fully find Him. Not at Athens, nor at Rome, but at Jerusalem, the knowledge of the one personal living God was made clear to man, made clear and sure to him by offering him a Revelation from above, and thus man's knowledge of God, man's faith in God, is an *acceptance* rather than a *discovery*—"by wisdom the world knew not God."

This same conclusion may be arrived at by a somewhat different line of thought.

Man's knowledge is not simply the result of his experience; he starts in the quest of this knowledge in possession of certain faculties. There is something more in the mind of man than in the phenomena on which his mind is exercised. It was refreshing to read, on the authority of the President of the British Association this year, "That experience is not the proper foundation of mathematical truth;" that "the mind itself contributes something." It was invigorating and a relief to be

raised above the depressing influences of materialism to be referred to Kant and Sir W. R. Hamilton, and to the answer of Leibnitz, "That there is nothing in the intellect which was not first in sensation *except* the *intellect* itself." The same is our true position towards the foundation of the spiritual life, faith in God. We start with the idea given, and more or less defined through the consciousness of our own existence: we go out from ourselves and find a world, physical, intellectual, moral, with a history, all full of corroborating considerations, and a revelation countersigned by Divine acts and men's satisfied wants, and we believe in God, but our belief is of the nature of an acceptance, rather than a discovery, for we are conscious of using powers at the beginning which we did not make, and of receiving help at the conclusion which came from above. Thus, we are indeed free, and, therefore, more responsible than we often like to remember, but not independent. Our faith is not the creation of our own reason, but is the "gift of God." "Christian truths are not (as has been well said) a human climax, but a Divine boon." "Faith (Dr. Liddon has told us) by which the soul lives, is mainly passive—at least, in respect of its intellectual ingredients." (The believing soul may or may not apprehend with scientific accuracy that which its faith receives. The "Word of Knowledge, that is the power of analysis and statement which is wielded by theological science, is thus a distinct gift, of great value to the Church, although certainly not of absolute necessity for all Christians. But without faith itself, it is impossible to please God.") Bishop Pearson had said the same, "Faith is the gift of God, not only in the object, but also in the act." Christ is not only given unto us in Whom we believe, but it is also given us in behalf of Christ to believe on Him. (This gift is a gift of the Holy Ghost working within us an assent to that which by the Word is propounded to us.) Thus, he adds, "as the increase and perfection, so the original or initiation of faith is from the Spirit of God (not only by an external proposal of the Word, but by an internal illumination of the soul)." This is indeed nothing but the reassertion of the statement of St. Augustine and the second council of Orange, when they maintained against the Pelagian and the semi-Pelagian errors, "that the beginning of faith was not from us, but from the grace of God," and quoted the texts from the Scripture—"To you it is *given* not only to believe in Him;" "Through grace ye are saved by faith, and that not of yourselves, it is *the gift* of God" (Eph. ii. 8), thus maintaining that "man's spiritual activity depends throughout on grace as originating, assisting, and sustaining it to the end." Thus then our relation to faith implies *a surrender;* we cannot fully find Him—we give up the method of independent discovery—our faith is of the nature of an acceptance—we accept the object, and assistance in the act of faith. This was Sailer's conclusion, in Germany, at the beginning of this century—Aufzugeben, annehmen, glauben—first the idea given, then the surrender, then the acceptance, then faith.

3. Another aspect of faith which needs our attention is the fulness of the act on our part. As faith is not a discovery of the intellect, so neither is it the bare assent of the intellect. It is rather a three-fold act, involving the intelligence, the heart, and the will—a surrender of the whole self—this is why perhaps we are so afraid of the terror of unbelief, of losing our faith, and falling from God, because we try to limit faith to an act of the intellect, and to lay hold on God merely

by the reason. This is to require of reason more than she was intended to do. God made us for Himself. He requires us completely, wholly. "My son, give Me thine heart," means the gift of all that is most inward, most central, most essential to man. If we could hold on to God merely by our reason we might be tempted to do this as a prudent refuge for a future day, and meanwhile give our hearts and our bodies to some other. Thanks be to God, the alarm of unbelief, the fear of losing our hold on God, has made us see now more clearly the fulness of the act of faith, and so we are each of us brought back to understand the words of our Catechism. My duty to God can only be accomplished by the dedication of *all* my *heart*, all my *mind*, all my *soul*, all my *strength*. It is not the fear of falling into the hands of the living God that is doing this *now*, but rather the more awful fear of falling *out* of them—the losing God, the being without God, *i.e*, lost.

A fourth consideration seems to follow. The end of our faith is not knowledge, but *worship*. We are so often occupied, and rightly, in contending for the very existence of God, that we are in danger of thinking our duty over when we are convinced that He is. This leaves our faith barren, useless, practically contradicted. The discoveries of science rightly end in admiration, the vision of God in adoration. "We admire the finite, we adore the Infinite." The adoring soul bends thought and heart and will before the footstool of the One self-existing, all-creating, all upholding Being. Adoration may or may not be accompanied with the prostration of the body; in its essence it is the prostration of the soul. It is this trustful, restful casting of our whole personality on the Person of God that so many of us need—in one word, worship—"Casting down their golden crowns;" it is this to which that great bulwark of the Christian faith would lead us (the Athanasian Creed), when, after the fullest exposition of the doctrine of the mystery of the Blessed Trinity that the Church possesses, we are reminded that the end is not simply knowledge, not exact theological definition, but worship; "so that in all things as is aforesaid, the Unity in Trinity, and the Trinity in Unity, is to be *worshipped*."

The practical outcome of this on our spiritual life should be, first, a more simple *humility*. Our faith, our all in all, is of the nature of a *surrender*, an *acceptance*, a *gift*. "What hast thou that thou didst not receive?" And then, secondly, a more indestructible *peace*. God made us for Himself, and neither the head nor the heart can find any real rest apart from Him—with Him in the simple village church, with Him in the family worship in the cottage home, with Him alone away at sea, with him in the crowded solitude of the young apprentice's lodging, with Him there should be the evidence of a peculiar humility and a peculiar peace. This contribution to the evidences for Christianity I would earnestly ask at your hands. It is a contribution in which all may join, rich and poor, learned and unlearned—the evidence of restful, peaceful, happy, upward-looking, worshipping lives, the proof that what the theologian maintains to be true is what the man wants.

To these few remarks on our present relation to faith, I would add a few more on our relation to love.

We should all probably agree that the "love of God and the love of man are man's perfection." But the practical problem is, How are

we to attain to this height? Masses of people hardly think of God at all, and in their relation to their fellow-men are selfish.

1. We need to consider very carefully the use of authority in morals. It is a valuable and significant fact, that Aristotle closes his treatise on ethics or personal morality, with a chapter that is an introduction to the *Politics*. It should teach us that ethics, practically considered, must be regarded as the vestibule to politics—that is, that the masses, the uneducated, and, indeed, the unprincipled in any class of society, will need the restraint of laws to bring them to the full freedom of the moral life. The masses—*i.e.*, the heathen masses of Aristotle's day—he tells us, acted from passion, not from reason; from fear of punishment, and in pursuit of their peculiar pleasures. With such, he says, mere treatises on the virtuous and honourable will have little or no power. They require the aid of laws; to ethics we must add politics. And Kant comes to the same practical conclusion when, at the close of his pure practical reason, he introduces us to what he calls Methodology, or "the mode in which he can give the laws of pure practical reason access to the human mind—*i.e.*, make the *objectively* practical reason *subjectively* practical also." We might have inferred all this, perhaps, from the form in which love is first commended to us in God's Revelation. It is enforced under the form of law. The *Ten* Commandments are ten rules for the regulation of the heart, or rather they are *two* rules of love—the love of God and the love of man—but they are cast in the rough legal negative form for man's sake. We must not forget that we need laws and rules as well as principles in teaching people to be good, in bringing them to the love of God and of their neighbour. This is a question which I should gladly offer for discussion—the use of authority in morals. The Church of Rome has, as far as the outward act is concerned, proved the power of authority in religious duties, at least among the less educated. With a sharp ecclesiastical "*must*" she commands attendance at her services, and gets it in a great degree. I am not speaking of the *moral value* of the acts so secured. I fear the moral value of the Roman system is but small. The compulsion endangers the moral freedom. But if *she* fails through *excess*, do we not fail from *defect* in the application of authority to the right living of our less educated brethren? Just as we find it helpful to induce them to join societies with rules for *thrift*, or *temperance*, or *clothing*, so should we not be wise to offer them the help of a rule of life for the safety of their souls, whether in the united form of guild or brotherhood, or any simple rule which they would acknowledge to be suited to their own spiritual needs? The spirit of the age is, I know, opposed to the idea of authority; it is a day of independence, discovery, progress; but I submit it for your consideration whether, if this is so, there is not special need of considering most carefully the relation of authority to morals, lest we fail in our duty to ourselves and to those who need our help. There is one kind of authority which is so bound up with human nature in all its stages, that this at least we might consider—*parental* authority. The authority of the father suggests wisdom, love, and power in reserve. Might not that be more beneficially used in relation to morals than it generally is, by parents over their children, by employers over their employed, by

all who have the responsibility of authority entrusted to them? With this use of authority in relation to morals or a good life, I desire to call your attention to the need of employing *mixed motives.* Pure principles of right and wrong do not touch the very wrong; they need laws and rules, and also rewards and punishments—allurements to the right. Let us not be driven from this true method of bringing human nature to its perfection by any ideal criticism that man should do right for right's sake. The advocates of pure rationalistic morals do not recognise that man's nature is fallen. The Bible tells us of this, and deals with us as we are, not perhaps as we might have been, and offers continually the allurement of rewards and the fear of punishments. God does this not as an insult to man—not because he thinks less highly of man than the modern rationalistic philosopher—but because He knows what is in man. He knows what human nature is capable of, and what He is Himself; and He knows that the rewards He offers will no more blind the soul from the perception of the love that gives them, than we were hindered from loving our parents by the pleasure of the playthings which first taught us the existence of their love. I desire to commend to your consideration the fatherly use of authority and the patient toleration of mixed motives in bringing man to his true end—the free, disinterested love of God and man.

To these few remarks on our present relation to faith and love, I should naturally add one word on our present relation to hope. Thank God, we have made some little progress of late years. Our churchyards are now often conspicuous with the chief symbol of our faith, and the flowers speak of love, and hope, and paradise regained; so that the Christian grave is better understood to be not a sign of failure, not a beacon to be avoided, not a mark of a wreck gone down, but rather a goal attained, the post where the race was won, the standard set up after victory, a spot not for despondency, but hope. Our funerals also, we may be thankful, are less overburdened by conventional signs of mourning, while the true grief is sustained and lifted upward by hymns and Eucharistic joy. All this is good, and yet have we not need to pray on, with St. Paul, that we may know better than we do "the power of His resurrection"? Are we not still too shy in speaking of those who have left us, "not lost, indeed, but gone before"? Is there not more comfort for us than we usually enjoy in following the primitive habit of commemorating the departed in our private and family prayers, and in our Eucharistic devotion? Might not the communion of the saints, beginning with the domestic calendar which each family year by year enriches, become in this way a greater reality than it usually is? Might we not thus day by day accustom ourselves so to realise the life of those who are living on the other side, that death would lose much of its terrors, and old age all its melancholy, knowing that each winter brings us really so much nearer to the eternal spring? Would not such a brightening hope be fitting for those who profess to be "waiting for Him," "looking for Him," "loving His appearing"? Yes, surely, the expression in our lives of a truer and brighter hope would be more consistent with the truth we all acknowledge—that to depart and to be with Him would be far, far better.

Such, I would venture to submit, are some of the special requirements

of our personal religion in the present day. 1. *A Faith* which has the characteristics of humility and peace. 2. *A Love* which in voluntary obedience is regaining its purity and perfect freedom. 3. An ever-brightening *Hope*.

The Rev. F. J. CHAVASSE, Rector of St. Peter-le-Bailey, Oxford.

A GREAT historical writer has recently said that the older men grow the more they learn to prize the simpler truths of Christianity. It is of one of these simple truths that I wish to remind you this morning. I venture to think that a very great need of the Church of England to-day is spiritual strength. Of material power she has shown no lack during the last half century. At no period in her history have more churches been built or restored, larger sums contributed for the work of God, greater care bestowed on the externals of public worship, more missions gone forth to evangelise the heathen in our great cities and in foreign lands, more widespread interest manifested in religious questions. And yet, have the spiritual results corresponded to this wonderful outburst of Church life? Has the standard of personal holiness risen? While the number of our communicants has almost quadrupled, has the number of our saints grown? With all this stir, and talk, and light, are churchmen as a whole more honest, straightforward, and self-denying? Have real conversions to God multiplied? Has the tone of the religious publications which issue from the press become more healthful and more spiritual? Is there not a cry everywhere for greater power for holiness, for active service, and for patient suffering? And all the time in our midst, within the reach of everyone, is the source of power, even the Holy Spirit of God, of Whom Christ promised, "He dwelleth with you, and shall be in you."

And how can the power which He gives be made ours?

1. We need a firmer grasp of this truth, that God the Holy Ghost dwells with the Church and in every true member of the Church. Here lay the strength of the early Christians. His Person and Presence and Work were realities to them. "They were filled with the Holy Ghost." "They walked in the comfort of the Holy Ghost." "They were sent forth by the Holy Ghost." "They prayed in the Holy Ghost." They tasted "the joy of the Holy Ghost." The Acts of the Apostles has been well called the Acts of God the Holy Ghost, for the men whose deeds it records were His channels. Hence their saintly lives, their prevailing prayers, their heartsearching words, their fruitful labours. But we, of to-day, while we declare in the Creed our faith in the Holy Ghost as "the Lord, and Giver of Life," while we praise Him in every *Gloria* and Ascription, and commemorate every year His descent at Pentecost, while in the collect for this week we have prayed that He "may in all things direct and rule our hearts," yet know practically little of His power, and live far below our privileges. If we but realised that we are His temples, that He, Christ's Vicegerent, dwells in us, should we lead the joyless lives that so many of us are content to live, dwelling down in the fog and mist of the valley, instead of rising to the sunlit heights where the peace of God rests? If we realised the

meaning of the promise, "Walk in the Spirit and ye shall not fulfil the lusts of the flesh," should we have so much cause to mourn over half-slain sins, and so often despair because worsted in the struggle with evil? If we realised that we were His channels and His instruments, chosen and fitted by Him to help forward the triumph of righteousness, and that in His hand the peculiar gift which each one possesses would multiply like the bread in the wilderness in the hand of the Lord, and prove sufficient to accomplish a work far beyond our highest hopes. should we not go out with stronger, braver, and calmer hearts to live and to speak, and to suffer, and to work, confident of the final victory, and careless about present appearances? We do not honour God the Holy Ghost by giving Him His due place in our hearts, and in our work, and He cannot honour us by transfiguring our lives, and by quickening our service.

2. We need, moreover, to cultivate those conditions under which alone the Holy Ghost can manifest His power, notably, submission and love. It has been said that a separate will is the cause of half the troubles in the world. It is certainly the secret of half the weakness in the Church. In grace, as in nature, forces work along the line of least resistance. And the Holy Spirit can be resisted, and grieved, and quenched. The proud and self-willed heart, impatient of guidance, bent on choosing for itself, enthusiastic in the service it likes, neglectful of what it dislikes, is no fit sphere for the Holy Spirit. "He can do there no mighty work." The heart which, like the fallen prophet, wants, as Fénélon says, "God to will what it wishes, so that in accepting His will it may have its own way," is no true conductor of the power of the Holy Spirit. But when, like Saul of Tarsus, we are ready to submit and commit—to submit our wills to His, and to commit ourselves into His hands and ask, "What shall I do, Lord?" it will be told to us, as it was to him, what we must do, and, like him, we shall be filled with the Holy Ghost. "God will work in us both to will and to do according to His good pleasure." And we must have love. The Spirit of love, who is love, and who gives love, can only live where love is. Do we wonder at our lack of saintliness and of power, at the vast chasm that separates us from the heroes of the early Church? Do we ask why the Church now creeps, where once she advanced by leaps and bounds? I think one reason lies in our want of love. Look at the bitterness of party spirit, its intolerance, its injustice, its prejudices; mark how it blinds and severs and despiritualises, how it exalts man and hides God, how the fire and fierceness of controversy, like some scorching wind, wither and blacken and deface the fairest flowers in the garden of God. How can the Holy Spirit work in spirits heated and angered by strife and clouded with passion, knowing but little of that Divine charity, "that suffereth long and is kind, that envieth not, that is not puffed up, that seeketh not her own, and is not easily provoked?" He cannot. We limit the Holy One of Israel. We grieve Him. Every day the cry goes up, "Take not Thy Holy Spirit from us," and every day we tempt God to withdraw His Presence from us by our unhappy divisions. If we must speak the truth one to another—and speak it we must—why cannot we speak it in love? Why must we colour, misrepresent, exaggerate, salt it with scorn and superciliousness, and clever but cruel jests? Why, if we protest against error—and protest we must—can we

not protest calmly, moderately, and in the spirit of Christ, to convince and not to irritate, in sorrow, and not in sarcasm? If we desire our Church to fulfil her mission, and to be the home of saints, the nursery of spiritual heroes, and the great missionary Church of the West, each of us who call her mother must learn to cultivate a spirit of love, and learn, where alone the lesson can be taught in its highest perfection, at the Cross of the Lord Jesus Christ. In full view of God's great love to man, in the realisation of the forgiveness of sins, which stands at the very threshold of the spiritual life, we shall best learn to love God because He first loved us. And he who loves God will love his brother also. And where love reigns there the Holy Spirit works.

3. We must use the means by which this strength is appropriated—solitary prayer for the individual, united prayer for the Church. Who of us has not felt the weakness, the unreality, the cowardice that spring from the want of solitude with God? Solitude has been the nurse of all the strongest spirits the Church has seen. In solitary prayer our Lord Himself drew strength to meet every crisis of His life on earth. The wilderness, the mountain, and the garden witnessed His lonely wrestlings with His Father. In this restless and busy age most of us live too much in public. We spend our spiritual strength and forget to renew it. We multiply engagements and curtail our prayers. We silence misgivings by the assurance that all true work is prayer. So it is, and God is able to bless those who, in the midst of busy lives, can but give Him ten minutes a day for worship, as much as those who can give their hours. But God demands our best, and often we fail to give it. By an error of judgment, or perhaps by the subtle force of inclination, which we mistake for necessity, we work when we ought to pray, because to an active mind work is far easier than prayer. And then God cannot bless. We lose in calmness, in depth, and in strength. We grow feeble, and shallow, and distracted; the work is done but superficially, and will not stand; the ring has gone out of the message, and the life has lost its power. The servant whom the Holy Spirit is to use must resist the tyranny of overwork. He must resolve to be alone with God. even if the hours spent with Him appear to rob his fellow-men of his services. It is said of that mighty spirit of the middle ages, Bernard of Clairvaux, that he found "on the days when he spent most time in prayer and in study of the Bible his letters were most rapidly written and persuasive, his active work the most quickly and successfully accomplished, and his own schemes were widened or lost in the greater purposes of God, anxiety was allayed, and the power of the Holy Spirit to which he had opened his heart was felt in every word he spoke, and in his very presence and look." "A gift," says Goethe, "shapes itself in stillness, but a character in the tumult of the world." And the gift of spiritual power is the child of solitude. And to solitary communion with God we must add united prayer. We need more life, fervour, and expectation in our Church services and our prayer-meetings. We need to wait upon God together as did the first disciples. "They were all with one accord in one place . . . and they were all filled with the Holy Ghost." "They lifted up their voices to God with one accord . . . and when they had prayed, the place was shaken where they were assembled together, and they were all filled with the Holy Ghost . . . and with great power gave the apostles witness of the

Resurrection, and great grace was upon them all." The united prayers of a company of men of one mind, pleading with faith, and fervour, and perseverance for one object, have power with God.

If, to-day, from this great gathering of English churchmen, varying, like the disciples, in social standing and intellectual power, and spiritual gifts, but one in their allegiance to their living head, Jesus Christ our Lord, there went up to God a like earnest and faithful cry for power—power for holiness, for service, and for suffering, and with it the sincere and steadfast purpose to cultivate the needful condition of submission to God's will and love for our fellow-men, a current of spiritual life would run through the parishes of our land which would be felt in its effects at the very ends of the earth.

ADDRESSES.

The Hon. C. L. Wood, President of the English Church Union.

I suppose there is no quality we value more in our relations to one another than sincerity. We feel it to be the salt of life, without which everything else is valueless. We welcome, therefore, any opportunities of sacrifice for the sake of those we love, as tests of the sincerity of our affection. But what is true of our relations to one another is no less true of our relations to God. Personal religion is, after all, the response the soul makes to the love of God for it, and if the soul loves God at all there is no question about which it will be more anxious than this—Do I really love God for Himself, or is my service to Him only another, and perhaps a subtler, form of self-seeking? There are, it seems to me, many reasons at the present time why we need anxiously to test our sincerity in this matter. The world, to some extent, patronises the Church, a certain amount of religion, not too much, perhaps, is an advantage in a worldly point of view. However little we may practice the duties of religion ourselves, we are all agreed that others ought not to neglect them. There may even be a certain fashion about going to Church, and being mixed up in charitable undertakings. Work among the poor is not the exception which it was when Lord Shaftesbury first began to set that example of self-sacrificing labour for others, which it becomes us less to praise than to imitate; so that when, in addition to all these secondary motives for serving God, we remember that His service has also the promise of the life which is to come, we may well be anxious lest at the root of much apparent love for Him there may not be a strong element of self. It is here that the true value of the trials of life, and the difficulties which surround God's service, become apparent. They are the means which God in His generosity affords us of testing the sincerity of our love for Him.

When the old French Monarchy was still standing in all its splendour, the courtiers of Louis XVI. must have had some difficulty in deciding whether they were serving the king for his sake or their own. Those doubts must have been dispelled for ever when, amid the loss of all things, they saw their king led out to die, and themselves proscribed for their loyalty to him. In the same way the manifold wisdom of God turns the ruin of the world, and the disorganisation of our nature, and our attraction to evil, into occasions of proving our love to Him by the opportunities they supply of suffering for His sake. We can hardly conceive the possibility of love to God

without the power at some time of rejecting Him ; and though one like John Stuart Mill may refuse Him that love, on the ground that it is impossible to reconcile His omnipotence with His goodness, the Christian, as he surveys his Master in His ascent to Calvary, and listens to the invitation to follow in the same way of sorrows, will exclaim, in the words of the Church's great hymn for Easter Eve, " *O Felix culpa*"—" O happy fault "—which has been not only the occasion of manifesting how greatly God has loved man, but of showing that man may love God, not for His gifts, but for Himself. Capacity for suffering, then, if we look at it aright, is one of God's best gifts to man, for it is the opportunity both of testing and developing our love for Him. Even on a lower level, those love most who have sacrificed most, and it is by the same rule of sacrifice, if we would be sincere with God, that we must try the reality of our personal religion. Take, for instance, our Communions. We were made for God. Our hearts cannot rest out of Him. We long for opportunities of intercourse with Him, and when we are told that at the ten thousand altars of His Church He vouchsafes an intercourse with Himself nearer and more intimate than was possessed by those who thronged His steps in Jerusalem, we are attracted to those altars, and it may be that we are led to think we really love Him because we are not insensible to the blessedness of approaching Him in the sacrament of His love. But is it so? Should we esteem it any proof of love merely because we took pleasure in the company of some great prince from whose favour we had everything to expect? The proof of love is not our mere willingness to approach Our Lord, from whom we have everything to gain, but what we sacrifice for the sake of our intercourse with Him. What it costs us ; what pleasures, amusements, companions, advantages, comforts, ease, we give up, in order to secure opportunities of being with Him. " All," says the author of the *Imitation*, " are ready to follow Jesus in His consolations, few in His trials." We are all ready to feast with Him, are we so ready to fast with Him? Surely, to mention one point, the Sunday communion ought not to be separated from the weekly self-denial of the Friday—the joys of Easter from the discipline of Lent. Surely we ought not to be willing to take all the pleasant parts of religion, and leave out the hard and the distasteful! It is well to rejoice in the beauty of the sanctuary, and to imitate the saints in their concern for the glories of the Church's worship ; but are we as careful to follow the saints in their love of mortification and self-denial? And if we fail to do so, how can we avoid the suspicion that it is not God, but self, which is the real object of our devotion! Again, how does our religion stand the test of constant and systematic reading of the Bible, and the habit of regular daily meditation? Both, no doubt, are difficult, and both, in order to secure time and opportunity for them, involve sacrifice and self-denial. Do we practise them? It is said that there is no practice so much neglected amongst us as systematic meditation or mental prayer, and yet that practice is productive of so much fruit! How good it must be, for instance, after our communions, to make a point, when we have time, of reading a portion of His Holy Word in the presence of Jesus Christ, and asking Him, who has come into our house to unfold to us Himself, the meaning of the life-giving words He once spoke on earth. How good it must be, morning by morning, to shut ourselves for a few moments from outward things in order to redress the balance between the seen and the unseen, and learn more and more the true value of the things which are eternal ; and have we not great reason to suspect the sincerity of our personal religion if all other books are more read than the one which from the beginning to the end speaks to us of Jesus Christ, and all other habits of devotion are preferred to that one in which more than any other we speak to Him and He to us.

Once more, to carry on a similar thought, how does our religion stand the test of loneliness and absence of all other distractions? Can we bear being alone with God? Carlyle in a recently published letter writes "that it was a wise regulation which ordered certain days and times to be set apart for seclusion and meditation." "Were a man forced," he says, "from time to time to keep silence, it were an incalculable benefit to his insight." But do we find ourselves acting on such principles in regard to the matters of our eternal interest? Do we ever in anticipation of that day, when all earthly things shall fade out of sight, endeavour to go apart from the multitude in order that in silence and seclusion we may see how our account really stands with God? If we were really sincere about our religion, should we find it so great an effort to spend the three days of a retreat alone with Him? And if we find that all these harder sides of religion are being neglected, have we not again great reason to fear that we may be mistaking emotion for true personal religion, and whatever our interest in the things of God, and of His Church, that we may be exhibiting before men and angels, that most unhappy spectacle of a soul, which, though often in church, and often at communion, yet by its incapacity for any real sacrifice for God or for its neighbours, by its altitude to the faults of its brethren—for those who are softest with themselves are often the hardest to others—by its toleration of doubtful pleasures, as, for instance, the amusements it frequents, the books it reads—in a word, by the unmortified character of its whole life, shows only too plainly that it has not yet learnt the first elements of what it is to possess the mind of Christ. Lastly, if we would test the sincerity of our personal religion, let us ask ourselves what is our attitude towards death? Death is our return to God, the rending of the veil, and the last opportunity for sacrifice; and yet how we shrink from his approach! He comes to us a friend with his hands full of gifts, and we turn away our faces from him. We cannot bear even to mention his name, or the names of those who have followed him behind the veil, lest we should be reminded of him. Surely if our love were very real, very sincere, this would not be the case. If the sufferings of life are so good just because they may be turned into so many opportunities for sacrifice and tests of love, death, the last and greatest opportunity for sacrifice, has a glory of his own which should attract all hearts. Even M. Renan, in his latest book, has said that the noblest thing in life is a death deliberately chosen on behalf of a great cause, and is not such a death within the compass of us all? True, we can no more avoid death than we can suffering; but suffering and death can be made our own if we accept them willingly, and so accepted they are transformed from the consequences of sin into instruments of sacrifice. If we love, must we not, in some degree at least, enter into the spirit of those words of our Lord. "I have a baptism to be baptised with, and how am I straitened till it is accomplished." Is not death the last penalty of sin? and shall the members of the Crucified shrink from the time when they too shall be stretched upon their cross? Nay, shall they not rather go forth to meet death joyfully in company with their Lord, as the last opportunity for mortification of self, and expiation for the past, as the test of their confidence—"though He slay me, yet will I trust in Him"—as the trial of their faith and their last conflict with Satan, as the end of their exile, and as the return to their true home. Though one may, not oneself, venture to make such words one's own, there are many, no doubt, who may, and I well remember two, now numbered, as I believe, with the saints, whose lives and deaths were bright examples to all who had the privilege of knowing them, of how truly they had realised the value of sacrifice as the test of love. The foundress of the Devonport Society, and the late Father O'Neill, of the Society of St. John the Evangelist, of Cowley, were once asked by the same person if they would not be glad to die, "No," replied the first, "I

should wish, if it pleased our Lord, to live for a thousand years, that I might have more opportunity of working for Him." "How could I wish or hope," said the second, "to be allowed to come out of school so soon." And as they had been in their lives, so were they in their deaths. The one, during a course of long and painful illness, which, owing to a paralysis of the throat, ended by a death of actual starvation, was only once heard to say, and then with a smile, that she felt hungry. The other, as he lay dying in all the agonies of cholera—and he suffered very greatly —was heard repeating to himself over and over again, so long as he had power to speak, "How good it is to suffer." Such examples come home to us all. How poor and of what little worth does our religion seem by the side of them; but, however great the interval between us and them, let us at least pray for grace to be enabled in our degree to follow in their steps, and above all to be preserved from the hypocrisy of profession without practice, and from the condemnation of that servant who knew His Lord's will but did it not.

The Rev. E. HOARE, Hon. Canon of Canterbury, and Vicar of Tunbridge Wells.

OUR subject this morning is personal religion, by which I understand our own personal individual life in the presence of God. I am not speaking of the corporate action of the Church, but of the personal life of the individual, of the work of God in our own souls and in our own private chambers. Now, with reference to this personal union with our Lord and Saviour, we must remember that it is the very secret of the life and action of the Christian; and the one point in our own personal religion that I would endeavour to bring before you is that there must be direct personal intercourse with God, as illustrated by the two words "nothing between." I take these two words as the motto for my address.

First, there must be "nothing between" in our personal *intercourse*. It is intercourse with Him who has graciously called us His friends, so that it becomes personal intercourse of friend with friend, of one who is utterly unworthy of the friendship with one who, in the magnificence of His grace and infinite grandeur, vouchsafes to call us friends. The man of God has his daily and hourly intercourse with God, not only when he is alone in prayer, but also when he is in the business of the world; and here we see the meaning of the words, "They shall go in and out and find pasture"—go in for communion, and come out to act in the world, and so every day pass in and out: *in* for intercourse, and *out* for action.

Then, in the second place, this personal religion seems to involve in it a personal *supply*. Going in and out we find pasture, and there is a personal supply for all our deepest needs. Have we not felt the need in the hour of sorrow? have we not felt the need when we have been bowed down as sinners before God? There are two passages, one in the 1st Thess. and the other in the 2nd, exactly corresponding in this matter of personal supply. In the first it says, "The God of Peace himself sanctify you wholly," and in the second, "The Lord of Peace himself give you peace always." In both passages there is mention of Himself, and there is "nothing between." He, the living Lord, Himself bestows the gift on His own waiting child.

Then, in the third place, this personal religion involves the personal *reflection* of His character. The person who is brought into close intercourse with the Lord comes out into the world reflecting the Lord's character. We want so to live

as the servants of the living God, that men may take knowledge of us that we have been with Jesus. In our families, amongst our servants, in our work, in our business, personal religion implies the personal life of a man who is in habitual fellowship and intercourse with no other than the Lord Jesus Christ Himself. We want to be perpetually reflecting His character and image. We want to be like the drops in a shower of rain that form the rainbow. You remember how that rainbow is produced—by the reflection of the sunbeams on countless millions of falling raindrops. Each drop as it falls reflects the beautiful sunbeam, and so the whole multitude of those reflections united forms the permanent arch—the token of the covenant of our God. So it is with personal religion. We are a vast multitude, and all falling very rapidly. We are very small, even as drops in the shower, but by God's grace we may reflect His image as we fall; and so, as a united body, exhibit before the world the true character of our Saviour Himself. But this brings us to the same conclusion. There must be "nothing between." If a cloud comes between the sun and the raindrop there is no light on the drop. This leads us to think of the personal character, temper, conversation, and thoughts. Is there not very often something between, some determination of our own will that cannot be given up, some idle thought in our heart, some bitter doubt rising in our minds to mar our intercourse with God? But if there is to be the reflection of the personal character of the Lord Jesus Christ there must be "nothing between."

Now I come to my last point, that a personal religion involves a personal *acceptance* of the great salvation presented to us by Christ Jesus. The time is sure to come when every one of us as an individual must come to the point, sooner or later, of the personal acceptance in our own souls of the great salvation which is in Christ Jesus our Lord. In Him we have the complete and finished Atonement, perfect and final for ever and ever. There on the Cross we see Him offering Himself as a full, perfect, and sufficient sacrifice, oblation, and satisfaction for the sins of the whole world, and by the strength of that Atonement proclaiming to us ruined, and guilty, and condemned men a free, perfect, and everlasting pardon. But there must be the personal act of the individual soul accepting that gift. While He accepts the sinner in boundless mercy the sinner accepts the gift in thankful faith, and then there is a personal religion, personal union, and personal friendship. There is the personal love of the Father which is met by the personal love of the reconciled child; and the result is that the thankful believer may say without hesitation, "truly our fellowship is with the Father, and with His Son Jesus Christ." But in such acceptance we are brought to the same conclusion as before, namely, "Nothing between." We have heard just now of deathbeds, and as I listened to the account of these deathbeds I could not but think of the deathbed of one of those grand noble heroes of India, Sir H. Edwardes, who, when he was seized with his death struggle, and his wife said, "Do you not wish to live longer that you may be better prepared to die?" he said, "No, for if I live twenty years more my Saviour cannot be a better Saviour to me than He is now." He had found the great propitiation by his blessed Saviour a perfect satisfaction to his soul. He had lived on it through the mutiny, and in perfect peace he could die on it when his hour came. But let us before we close this meeting get one step beyond the deathbed and the death hour. Surely we must look beyond that, and must not stop there. The hope of the Christian Church is not in death, but in the Resurrection—in the glorious coming of our Lord and Saviour. Our hope is in His appearance, and there are many who reverently trust that His coming will be very shortly, to raise the dead, to gather His elect from the four corners of the earth, and to bring up from the grave all those dearly beloved ones whom we have laid there, until they may with us be caught up to

meet the Lord in the air. And now I come back to my two words, "nothing between"—aye, nothing between—for the words are, "so shall we ever be with the Lord." There will be "nothing between" then, and more than that there will be the perfect reflection of His own image. That reflection, how imperfect it is now, and how we must mourn over its defects, but then there will be a perfect vision and a perfect reflection. Perfect vision, for we shall see Him as He is, and perfect reflection, for we shall be like Him. So even now we may draw very near unto Him, not drawn to Him by mere suffering, but brought near to Him by the power of the Holy Spirit, by the loving God, revealing Christ Jesus to our souls, bringing home His own words to our hearts, and so moulding us into His image, as St. Paul says, "But we all, with open face, beholding as in a glass the glory of the Lord, are changed into the same image from glory to glory even as by the Spirit of the Lord."

The Rev. HERBERT JAMES, Rector of Livermere, Bury St. Edmunds.

THERE are two points in connection with this subject of personal religion which I wish more particularly to lay before you—its end, and the development necessary to that end. Godliness, or Godlikeness, Christliness, or Christlikeness, saintliness, or saintlikeness, is its idea, its essence, and its end. For what is personal religion? Is it not the rebinding of the individual spirit to God, with a view to complete resemblance and consequent complete representation? Is it not the life of Christ in the spirit thus rebound with all that tends to maintain and further it, whether act of study, or act of devotion, or act of moral virtue? Personal religion is a principle as well as a power. Taking its rise from a personal union with a Personal Christ, through the Personal Spirit, it has its course through personal communion, and its consummation in "being satisfied when we awake with His likeness." This was God's gracious purpose for us from the first. He created us in His own image, and after His likeness. And when the mirror in man's heart was so shattered that you could hardly say of any part of it, "Lo, this is a counterfeit of God," He was pleased so to arrange His work of new creation as that we now once more see, and reflect and be that glory of God of which we had so far come short. This then is to be our life purpose too. We are to aim at being living incarnations of the Sermon on the Mount, and I conceive that I shall therefore best help forward this end of personal religion by turning your thoughts for a few moments to certain conditions of its development.

You will feel that personal religion, if it is to be worth anything, must be progressive. It admits of advance and demands it. It is a principle, and must work. It is a power, and must have exercise. It is a life, and must grow. It may not stand still for a moment, either on its intellectual, or devotional, or practical side. Spiritual waxwork is quite as dead as any other waxwork, and far more ghastly. But what is a stationary personal religion but spiritual waxwork? What, however, are the conditions of the development required? The first I would mention is this:—

1. Realisation.—It is with this that all true personal religion begins. The moment of trust is the moment of union. Then it is that the first flow of the life-sap commences, and the spirit of man receives its first true impulses Godward, from the Spirit of God. The sense of personal acceptance draws out affection. Love begets and increases love. The wilful sinner in the city becomes at once the willing servant at the Master's feet. Now if you check faith you check the flow also. The life is poor because the love is cold. And this is just what is happening to many. There

is too little reality, because there is too little realisation. Peace is essentially necessary to progress. No man works well in chains. If our personal Christianity is to be of a wholesome and vigorous sort, it must have its roots deep down in a consciousness of present forgiveness. Short of this we shall only dwindle and shrivel up, and become the mere shadows of what we should otherwise have been. There would be more true personal religion if there was more of real personal resting on Christ.

2. A further condition of development, and so a further help to Godliness, may be found in Faithfulness. And by this I do not so much mean faithfulness to convictions, or even faithfulness to truth, but I mean the steady ongoing discharge of life duty. There is a religion of daily life which is quite as important as, and infinitely more difficult than, the religion of daily devotion. It is not common just because it has mainly to do with common things. For to carry Christ into all companies, to cultivate the honesties of trade and profession whilst steeped to the eyes in business, to maintain a true morality in politics and public affairs whilst expediency is the order of the day, to make a conscience of the genialities and courtesies and unselfishnesses of social and family life, whilst self-indulgence and independence are the great gods of the age—in a word, to live out the second halves of the Epistles of the Imprisonment, and to move in man's world with a single eye to God's glory—all this may not amount to being great, but it is being faithful. It is the possession and exhibition of the mind of Christ. And such faithfulness, whilst it has regard to common things, has regard also to the things which are called little. With it nothing is really small, because "all duty is one," and because there is nothing into which God cannot be brought. And the inbringing of God at once ennobles everything, whilst the intention of pleasing Him at once consecrates every act and redeems it from the charge of insignificance. The size of his talent does not matter, the direction does. Now, this faithfulness is not beyond our reach. It is quite possible for us to learn what Chrysostom calls the διηνεκὴς ἐργάσια—the ceaseless working of our Father in little things as well as great, and to become "imitators of Him as dear children." And, it is as paying as it is possible. Faithfulness, like thankfulness, obtains a larger measure of the Holy Spirit. *Habenti dabitur.* Moreover, it tends to form character, to fit us for places of greater responsibility, and thereby fix our condition. The full hand shall be made fuller; the lower prepares and insures the higher. See to it, therefore, that it be said to you hereafter, if not "Well done, 'good,'" at least "Well done, 'faithful' servant."

3. I pass to another condition of development, and thus of likeness, viz., fellowship with God. It was a wise saying of that prince of missionaries, that true exemplar of personal religion, Henry Martyn, "May I never prefer work for God to communion with Him." It is indispensable to the existence of all right godliness. For the life that God gives can only be sustained by that which God is. The spirit of man grows by what it is fed on, and its proper nourishment is the supply of the Spirit of God. For this we must walk, not only in, but with the Spirit. For I hold that fellowship consists, not only in that which touches the devotional side of religion, the prayer, the praise, the participation in sacramental acts; nor only in that which touches its intellectual side, the thoughtful study of God's Word, or the reverent observation of God's providence, but something beside and beyond it. It is personal intercourse with a personal God. It is the habit of speaking to Him as a man speaks with his friend. It is the looking to the unseen yet everpresent and abiding Comforter, as He joins us by the way. It is the listening to the unseen yet most impressive Teacher as He takes of the things of Christ and shows them to us, and specially at the Holy Communion. It is the leaning on the arm of the unseen but ever-ready Guide and Counsellor, as He says, "This is the way; walk ye in it." This is fellowship; where this is, there is a

growing acquaintance with God's character; a fuller knowledge of His glory in the Person of Jesus Christ; a clearer tracing of the finer lines of His truth, and with this a gradual transformation into His likeness. For if it be true that resemblance comes of lifelong partnership, if it be true that "he that walketh with wise men shall himself be wise," then he who companies with Jesus, he who walks with Wisdom itself, shall be changed from glory to glory by the Lord the Spirit. Union, communion, communication, these give a depth and force to all true personal religion.

4. I can only glance at one other aid to the development of personal religion,—viz., Expectation. We must have motives as well as means, and we find one in this—the hope of the Advent. If we are to live soberly, righteously, and godly (only another name for personal religion), we must look for the glorious appearing of our Lord Jesus Christ. For this enables us to deal with our specific hindrances. It is the thought of this Personal return, with its promises of rest, reunion, and reward, which helps us to purify ourselves even as He is pure. It acts as a lever to our affections, and also reminds us of things above; it throws its light on the true nature of heavenly things: it disillusionises, it disentangles. It nerves under disappointment, it quickens in the face of difficulty. Above all, it delivers us from the paralysing power of sin, by revealing and bringing near to us the possibilities and power of the holy life beyond; and as there is not a hindrance which it cannot meet, so there is not a grace which it cannot assist. Take any feature of God's character which requires imitation, and you will find it urged and enforced in connection with the paramount truth of the Lord's return. If then we are so to live in the present that the future may be sure, we must also so live in the future that the present may be what it ought to be—holy, consistent, trustful, charitable.

I must stop. We are building for eternity when we look to the development of our personal religion, and its consequent issue in the likeness of God. But if that building is to be established as well as to be for beauty and glory, it must stand on these four pillars, realisation, faithfulness, fellowship, expectation. There is a cry abroad that our religion is losing all its fibre and muscle, that it fails to supply a law sufficient for guidance; fails to grapple with the vices and follies of the day; is a sort of Christianity without much of Christ in it. This is not the truest way of putting the case, but it has some truth in it. Personally, we may need a reminder of a certain lack of strength. If so, we have to travel more from the Temple of the twelfth year to the house at Nazareth, from the carpenter's shop to the sea shore of Capernaum; from the solitude of the mountain to the solemnities of Calvary, if that strength is to be won. Let us take a fresh departure, remembering that Christianity is only a series of beginnings over again. I have no better wish for you and for myself than this, that the epitaph of each of us may be as the epitaph of Jehoshaphat, "His heart was lifted up in the ways of the Lord." "There was religion in his life and life in his religion. And Christ, Christ was the principle, the pattern, and the power of that life, even unto the end."

Eugene Stock, Esq.

I THINK it right to say that I am not here at my own request; I did not send in my card, and when I came into this hall I had not the remotest notion that I should be called upon to speak, but I do so in obedience to the authorities of this Congress. I wish to call your attention to one point only. I would ask this question:—what sort of personal religion is it that will be a real power in the Church and in the world, which will have power to win the masses to the Church, and prove a real

barrier to the infidelity and irreligion now so prevalent in our midst? I find the answer to my question in the words of the Book of Nehemiah, "The joy of the Lord is your strength." We want a happy, bright, personal religion; we want to get rid of all the gloom and sadness which in some minds attaches to religion; we want to realise a verse in St. Peter's first epistle, "In whom, though now ye see Him not, yet believing, ye rejoice with joy unspeakable and full of glory." These are very strong words—which of us realise them in our own experience? Yet this realisation I believe to be the great want of the Church at the present time. Now we have had from time to time biographies of our great and good men, which reveal, to some extent, the character of their religious life. I am thinking of one, the biography of a great and mighty, and justly honoured man, a book which has been in the hands of us all lately. Now the diary of that great man, as presented to us, is full of ejaculatory sighs and groans, one might almost say *de profundis*. Did not that dead man have his seasons of holy joy and calm peace? I am persuaded that he did, but the biographer tells us nothing of them; and the religion pictured in that book is not a bright or happy religion. I am thinking of another biography, much less read, of another man much less known. His diary is full of an ecstatic joy, which must be thought by those who did not know the man, to be exaggerated. In this case I will give the name. I mean the late Rev. William Pennefather. Those who knew him know well that the expressions in his diary are not exaggerated; and that no one did more in his day to brighten up the religion of the people than that man. Yet he belonged to a school which, according to popular theory, ought to have made him sour, gloomy, and long-faced. But it did not; and it does not! Now, what is the secret of this bright, free, and joyous religion? I do not mean a religion that is not reverent and solemn—God forbid; or one that forgets the tremendous realities of sin, the ceaseless conflict in which we are engaged; but one that is powerful to overcome, just because of its brightness. I think we may find the answer to this question in an historical incident which ought to be in all our minds just now. Nearly four hundred years ago there was a German monk who was striving after a higher and nobler ideal of religious life; he disciplined and denied himself to the utmost, in order to get the peace he craved for; but he got it not. All his self-discipline failed to give it him. Nor did he get it until another monk, an older man, came and said to him, "Brother Martin, remember the article in thy Creed, 'I believe in the forgiveness of sins.'" Brother Martin did believe, and found the truth of the words of the Epistle to the Hebrews, "Ye that have believed do enter into rest." And what was the result? That monk, whatever else he afterwards did, good, bad, or indifferent, at all events did this, he restored to the Church of Christ the great fundamental doctrine that the soul of man must come into direct personal uninterrupted contact with God, if the peace that follows the sense of forgiveness is to be obtained. It is only when you and I—and I say it with unfeigned humility—it is only when we realise that there is full and free forgiveness once, and for ever, to be found in the one Saviour, that the benediction presently to be pronounced by your lordship will be really fulfilled in us, and the peace of God which passeth all understanding keep our hearts and minds, or that the prayer will be fulfilled which the Church offers up daily, "Make Thy chosen people joyful."

The Right Rev. the PRESIDENT.

THE last speaker said he had not risen of his own accord, that he only spoke to you in consequence of the request that was made to him. And that is true of the other speakers who have addressed you this morning. They have all of them spoken to you only at our earnest request; and I have not a single card upon the table before me. Some one will say—none here will say it, but some outside may say—"Ah, yes, they can talk of the subjects which divide them, things which stir their blood, things which interest them in their life or in their church parties, but when you come to deal with the question of personal religion, they have nothing to say." I read this silence—I mean the silence beyond those beautiful words we have heard—I read that silence otherwise. I can understand, because I can feel, what reluctance there must be in most men's hearts to speak of personal religion. Speak of it, and you are reminded by conscience at once of the faults in the religion which is personal to you. You speak of prayers, and there comes back to you the prayers that were half-prayed,

that had been almost better omitted than prayed as they were. You speak of Holy Communion, and you remember the times when your Communion went nigh to add to your sins. You speak of those things; they have been spoken of well—may I venture to say so to-day. You speak of faithfulness, you speak of realising things that are unseen, you speak of all those beautiful qualities of the Christian life and of the Christian man, and there comes back to you as you try to describe them the fearful gulf between the picture you have drawn and the only original that you truly know. Can you wonder that there are many good Christians—aye, the best Christians, who will hesitate to say one word about personal religion, lest it should seem to imply that that religion was all their own. I thank from my heart those good friends of ours who have overcome these scruples and those feelings, and as a matter of duty and charity, and kindly submission to the authority that was over them, have spoken out of their hearts to us this morning. I thank them from first to last with all my heart. I have asked myself once or twice whilst we have been gathered together here this morning, why is it that this meeting is the largest we have had since the Congress met—why have these benches been thronged as high as they can be—not by those who have been perpetually shifting to and fro, but with an attentive and thoughtful throng? I do not think they came because they hoped that if there was a strong demonstration of personal religion it would be a help to the Church. It would be a wonderful help indeed to the Church, for 3,000 men and women of a deep personal religious life themselves could, I was going to say, move the world. But it was not for that cause you came in such great numbers this morning. May I venture to interpret the meaning of this large gathering? Is it not this? that whatever may be the interest of the great questions which either unite or divide churchmen; whatever the tender grace of feeling that belong to some of those matters which we have discussed; whatever the poetry which invests some of the antiquities of the Church with beautiful colouring; whatever there may be that is giving light and shadow to our meetings—sometimes the pleasant, kindly jest, sometimes the keen but courteous retort—all this is good, interesting, valuable, diversified, not a word has anyone to say against it, but there is that which goes deeper and closer than all this, and that is each man's own condition in the sight of God. And I suppose—I believe—that you come here so strong this morning, because you each hoped that you might hear something which would touch that relation between yourselves and God, and send you away the better for hearing it. These meetings about personal religion have a personal history. I fancy that I cannot be wrong in saying that there are those here and elsewhere who could cast back their recollection to one or another of the Congresses, and could remember a word that was spoken—it may be only one particular word, it may be one thought that was pressed home to them; one face they looked upon, one personality they took in, one character they learned to love that morning better than before—something there was in that "personal religion meeting"—as they call it, of the Congress, now long gone by, which you, and you, and you, my friend, remember still; something that has gone into the store and treasury of mercies out of which are drawn the helps that make men better as they grow older; something which you would not willingly let die now, which for the world you would not have left unheard then. May I give you this good, kindly, and Christian wish—that something spoken this morning will be remembered if you live for many a year to come. When you look back to the Reading Church Congress, you will say, not on platforms perhaps, not even to your nearest and dearest friend, but you will say it on your knees in prayer, "Thank God for that morning I heard that word."

TOWN HALL,

FRIDAY MORNING, OCTOBER 5TH.

The Very Rev. the DEAN OF YORK in the Chair.

ECCLESIASTICAL COURTS.

PAPER.

The Rev. HENRY HAYMAN, D.D., Rector of Aldingham, Lancashire; Honorary Canon of Carlisle; and Ex-Headmaster of Rugby School.

THE Commissioners claim to have their scheme judged as a whole—a difficult task in a paper of twenty minutes, but the value of the whole is measured by its most potent factor. That factor is the Court of Final Appeal. They recommend for final appeal a court of lay judges learned in the law, to be appointed by the Crown, and claim to have provided in earlier stages for a full hearing of spiritual matters by spiritual judges. This may be illustrated by a game of cards. The lay hand is to hold all the trumping suit, and the spiritual hands are to divide all the other picture cards among them. The spiritual courts are amused with a show of authority, which the lay court will be able to reduce to a shadow by trumping the trick. Further, the lay court may, if one of themselves demand it, but not otherwise, call in the archbishops or bishops to answer specific questions. The lay judges are to be five in number for each case, and summoned by the Lord Chancellor in rotation. In their appointment the spiritualty is to have no voice, check, or challenge whatever. I say first, then, that a court so constituted is a non-spiritual court. Further, each such judge is to declare himself a member of the Church of England—need thus take no oath nor subscribe the Thirty-nine Articles. Such declaration of any such layman (taking into view the total abeyance of discipline) is obviously valueless as a guarantee. They are not to be bound to state reasons for their decision, and are thus safe from criticism. They are, on appeal reversing sentence, to dictate judgment to the court below. The judge who is NOT amenable to discipline, who is exempt from oath and subscription, is to overrule the judge who is bound by all these tests. The man in a position of "greater freedom and less responsibility" is to overrule the man who is in the converse position.

Taking this, then, as a whole, it is easy to see that the whole gives no security to the Church against the entire voice of the spiritualty being on spiritual questions choked in the last resort by non-spiritual personages. The question here obtrudes itself, how are these permanent judges to be remunerated. First-class lawyers don't often work cheaply. If they are to have salaries proportioned to their responsibility and to their rank,

assumed equal to that of privy councillors, whom they displace, or if they are paid (pardon the homely phrase) by the job, there will be a heavy bill for some one to pay. Will any conceivable Government face the House of Commons with such a proposal of salaries? I presume not, and that therefore the Church will be expected to pay for the suppression of her own liberties, guaranteed under Magna Charta and often since. This is no mere question of detail, but one of well understood principle. If the Church is to pay them, I say then, if for no other reason (and there are many), the Church ought to appoint them, that is, if they are to be appointed at all. But the question does not seem to have visited the minds of the Commissioners.

I wish briefly to examine—(1) The assumption on which the Commissioners rest their principle; (2) the colourable precedents, if any, in history for it; (3) the spiritual authority which a court of such personages can be supposed to have; to which, if time allows, I would add a few recent samples of the wisdom shown by similar personages in well-known past cases, as an index how far such are likely to give satisfaction in the future.

1. The fundamental assumption of the report on this behalf, in their own words, is, "That every subject of the crown who feels aggrieved by a decision of such court (that is, of an ecclesiastical court) has an indefeasible right to approach the throne itself with a representation that justice has not been done him, and with a claim for the full investigation of his case." Now this doctrine, if true, must apply to *every* British subject, its terms being co-extensive with the relation of subject and crown. But it notoriously does *not* apply to such subjects as are members of the Establishment in Scotland. It is therefore unsound for the purpose for which it is applied, and indeed it is plain that, if it be true at all, the subject is equally entitled to be heard after a lay court's decision (that of the House of Peers for instance) as after an archbishop's. The spiritualty having an inherent jurisdiction of its own, there is no more reason why the *finis litium* should not occur when the highest spiritual court has decided a case, than why it should occur when a non-spiritual court has reviewed that decision. This is fully recognised in Scotland, although there the Establishment is far more directly the creature of statute. There continuous free traditions make spiritual liberties a weighty reality, while in England continuous servile traditions make them a solemn sham. "Pleasant justice," says Montesquieu in his "Esprit de Lois," "is that which is bounded by a river or a mountain, right on this side of the Alps and wrong beyond them." Such is spiritual liberty in Great Britain. I infer that this is an undue assumption for the use made of it, and therefore will not bear the conclusion sought to be established by means of it.

2. I next pass to the colourable precedents, if any, in history, for such a purely lay politico-legal court of appeal. The cases of an emperor, as Constantine, reluctantly acting as umpire or arbitrator when appealed to by both parties, or by one and the appeal not rejected by the other, has obviously no bearing on the question of a permanent lay tribunal as proposed. Indeed, Hosius, Bishop of Cordova, admonishes Constantius himself, "On this subject do not teach us, but rather learn these things from us. To you God has granted empire, to us the things which He has entrusted to the Church," and adds, "For who, if he saw a prince

constituting himself a judge of bishops and presiding in ecclesiastical judgments, would not rightly say he was the abomination of desolation spoken of by Daniel the prophet?" I might quote, if time allowed, the code of Theodosius, the edicts of Marcian, the novèlls of Justinian, all to a similar purpose, all supporting the statement of Hooker, "Of this most certain we are, that our laws do not suffer a spiritual court to entertain those causes which are civil, nor yet, if the matter be indeed spiritual, a mere civil court to give judgment of it;" and Field (of the Church), his younger contemporary, "We all teach that laymen have no voice decisive, which may be confirmed by many reasons." And Hooker again says, "Whether it be therefore the nature of courts, or the form of pleas, or the kind of governors, or the order of proceedings in whatsoever spiritual business, *for* the received laws and liberties of the Church the king hath supreme authority and power, but *against* them none;" and yet further citing St. Ambrose of Milan, "Kings have dominion to exercise in ecclesiastical causes, but according to the laws of the Church."

The precedents and *dicta* just cited and referred to make wholly against the recommendation of the Commissioners. A survey of the courts of contemporary religious bodies outside our own Church is equally barren of results in its favour. The Commissioners sweep the horizon of the past and present alike in vain for even a solitary precedent.

I presume, however, that the historical quasi-precedent chiefly, if not solely, relied on, is to be found in the court of delegates (so called), the history of which is minutely traced in several pages of the report, but the lesson of that history seems to me to be wholly missed. The statute of 25 Henry VIII. c. 19, from which that court dates, contained (1) The submission of the clergy; (2) a provision for a commission to review, and which did review, the whole system of Church law, including therefore appeal *inter alia;* and (3) three clauses giving appeal to the king in chancery by delegates to be appointed by him. The first two had certainly the concurrence of the convocations; and indeed the second, the review of Church law, was in consequence of their petition to the king. Whether the clauses of appeal had also their concurrence is doubtful. Canon Stubbs, I see, inclines to think they had. On the evidence recorded by him I venture to differ from so high an authority. But the point, as I will presently show, is not important. The commission for review of Church law consisted of 16 laity and 16 clergy, and its labours lasted to the close of Henry VIII.'s reign. The clergy again petitioned for its resumption, and a new commission, more minutely formulated, of eight prelates, eight other divines, eight civilians, and eight lawyers, continued its labours. The two commissions covered 19 years. We have the result of their labours in the *Reformatio Legum Ecclesiasticarum*, including expressly a machinery for appeals, as part of a larger system, and framed in accordance with it. The members of the two commissions included the very flower of theology, as also of canonical and other jurisprudence at the period. If it was intended, as it must have been, that those labours should bear fruit, it follows inevitably that the concurrent provision of appeal to the king in Chancery, which set up the court of delegates, was merely *ad interim* until that fruit should be

matured; and thus the Parliament who enacted, and the clergy who accepted (if they did accept), the appeal to the king in Chancery, must needs have regarded it as temporary and provisional only, because the very same statute contained, at the request of the clergy, a provision to supersede it, by dealing with appeal *ab integro* as part of a larger whole. Therefore I can afford to make Canon Stubbs a present of the consent of the clergy to those clauses of appeal. What then was the court of appeal suggested in the *Reformatio Legum Ecclesiasticarum?* It was in any graver case Convocation itself, in others, three or four Bishops chosen by the king. To this court cases were to be brought when appealed from the Archbishop to the king.

But by the human accidents which frustrate the wisest forecasts, and lead some to say "nothing happens but the unforeseen," this most important branch of the Reformation, as a whole, the reform of Church law, has hung interrupted and frustrated from the death of Edward VI. to this hour, while the temporary and accidental machinery of working appeals by delegates had run a course of nearly three centuries when abolished in 1832. And on that dropped branch of the Reformation hangs the withered fruit of more jurisprudential wisdom in Church matters than those three centuries, plus the half-century since, have ever seen.

Now this obvious lesson, that the machinery of delegates must have been intended merely as a stop-gap, is what the Report of the Royal Commissioners wholly misses. The same facts furnish an illustration of what sort of delegates it might reasonably be expected the Crown would appoint. King Edward's Commission included eight prelates, eight other divines, eight civilians, eight lawyers. And now, as proposed by this recent Commission, this last element, "Like Aaron's serpent, swallows all the rest"! And the fact, if fact it be, of the majority of actual delegates during those 300 years having been laymen, is another purely accidental feature, contrary to the spirit of the Reformation settlement, and to the precedents which it furnishes, which clearly and strongly affirmed, as I shall presently show, the entire competency of the spiritualty for all "causes of spiritual learning." And yet upon this accident of an accident the recent Commission find, if they find anywhere, a precedent for the gravest factor in the whole system which they recommend. Every fact which I have recited is duly registered by them. But they read history "in the letter which killeth, not in the spirit which giveth life." I am happy to be able to exclude from this stricture Sir Robert Phillimore, who records in a few weighty sentences his dissent from his colleagues. Dr. Freeman also dissuades confining the hearing of appeals to the members of a single profession.

Through the deplorable miscarriage of the reform of Church law, its elements remain jumbled rather than blended—

(1) The ancient Canon law;
(2) Prerogative law;
(3) Canons of 1604;
(4) Statutes of most periods since, and several before.

All these contribute to the medley. As in Milton's picture of "Eternal Anarchy,"—

> "Hot, cold, moist, and dry, *four* champions fierce,
> Strive here for mastery, and to battle bring
> Their embryon atoms, ...
> . . . . Chaos umpire sits,
> And by decision more embroils the fray,
> By which he reigns."

But I spoke of the witness given to the spiritualty by the Reformation settlement. Henry VIII., enquired of by the province of York touching the title of supreme head, answered—

"As to spiritual things . . . forasmuch as they be no worldly or temporal things, they have no worldly nor temporal head, but only Christ that did institute them, by whose ordinances they be ministered here by mortal men, elect, chosen, and ordained as God hath willed for that purpose, who be the clergy."

And in his letter to the national synod of both provinces, convened to consider Ann of Cleves' divorce, we read :—

"We, who are wont to abide by your judgment in all other weightier matters concerning this Church of England which affect ecclesiastical government and religion, . . . have thought it meet . . . that explanation and communication should be made to you, . . . so that *we* may lawfully venture under the authority of our whole Church . . . to do and effect that . . . which *you* may decree to be lawful according to the laws of God."

More important still in regard to constitutional form is the preamble of 24 Henry VIII., c. 12, which declares the "Body spiritual of the realm to have power, so that when any cause of the law divine happened to come in question, or of spiritual learning, it was declared and interpreted by that part of the body called the spiritualty, now being usually called the English Church, which hath always been and is, for knowledge, integrity, and number, sufficient to declare and determine all doubts without the intermeddling of any exterior person." These examples, all taken from the annals of the most violently arbitrary sovereign in our history, show that even he was compelled to recognise the rights of the spiritualty as proceeding from Christ Himself, and as too broadly and deeply founded in constitutional usage for himself to deny them. This last cited statute, after repeal intervening, was revived by Elizabeth's statute, and remains in force still. It entitles me to say that to provide a court without a single spiritual element, to override the entire spiritualty on spiritual questions, is an outrage on the spirit of that statute, and even a violation of its letter, as well as of the Reformation settlement, of Magna Charta, and of William I.'s Charter, of which I shall further speak, which forbids "the bringing to a tribunal of secular men a cause which relates to the government of souls."

3. I proceed to the question what spiritual authority such a tribunal can be supposed to have, as against a sentence of a spiritual court which it overrules. I see no element of spiritual authority in it. In spiritual rulings conscience is supreme. The spiritual rights of the Church of England are nothing else than the rights of conscience in her members, collectively exercised. Those rights must surely include the interpretation of her own formularies. The old Court of Delegates might conceivably have been worked in consistency with and recognition of those rights. Now, except to set aside and trample on those rights, the proposed lay court will never be appealed to, and

thus outruns the one isolated precedent of Tudor arbitrariness, in itself, as I have shown, a mere interim measure, which formed the solitary quasi-precedent for it. Pray consider this :—our formularies are our Church's exposition of Holy Scripture in the solemn passages on which they rest. In them she fulfils her office of witness, keeper, and interpreter of the Divine Word. In them she gives her ministers her own voice of authority. But, as proposed, between the Church and her ministers, both spiritual authorities, a non-spiritual authority, that of a court without a spiritual element, claims to step in and re-expound the Church's exposition of Holy Writ, and overrule the ruling of her lawful officers. Now I say this is not only a breach of constitutional practice, and notably of the Reformation settlement, but a direct tyranny over the rights of conscience, which outside the Church of England all subjects of the Crown enjoy, and which, it seems, are effectively denied only to those within her pale. Let me quote the weighty words of Hooker : "Our judges in causes ecclesiastical are either ordinary or commissionary ; ordinary, those whom we term ordinaries, and such by the laws of this land are none but prelates only, whose power to do that which they do is in themselves, and belongeth unto the nature of their ecclesiastical calling. In spiritual causes a lay person may be no ordinary ; a commissionary judge there is no let but that he may be ; and that our laws do evermore refer the judgment of spiritual causes unto spiritual persons, such as are termed ordinaries, no man which knoweth anything in the practice of this realm can easily be ignorant." (E. P. VIII., viii. 3.)

If "a lay person may be no ordinary," how may a tribunal of such persons claim to overrule and set aside the spiritual decisions of every ordinary of the realm? I submit that, if Hooker's words have any weight, the authority of such a court is null and void. "All power," says the same wise guide, "is given unto edification, none to the overthrow and destruction of the Church." I would entreat my brethren to study the last book of the Ecclesiastical Polity before they make up their minds on this question.

But in order to judge how laymen lawyers may be trusted in the future, take a few specimens in the present and near past. Lord Penzance cites the Charter of the Conqueror. It bids the Bishop, etc., no longer to hold pleas (*placita teneat*) in the hundred, but whosoever is arraigned under episcopal law to come to a place which the Bishop may choose, there to answer, etc. ; and promises against contumacy coercive force in case of need. Now the Bishop previously, so Canon Stubbs says, might "exercise jurisdiction as well in the shire moot as *outside* it." (Historical App. I., p. 23, col. 2, top.)

The "coming to any place the Bishop might choose" was therefore no novelty. Nor was the coercive force in case of need any novelty, for Canon Stubbs infers from analogy the probable use of this before. The Bishop's jurisdiction, and the episcopal laws and canons which regulated it, are all assumed as pre-existing. All that is demonstrably new is the negative fact that the "hundred" court was no longer to be the sphere of its exercise. Now hear Lord Penzance's comment, echoing, I believe, all the Crown lawyers before him, "The Conqueror *provided* for the *holding* of separate courts for the administration of the episcopal laws." The king, I say, provided *not* for holding courts at all, but only for their separation, and let the Bishop fix them where

he would. Lord Penzance continues, "It was the king therefore who CREATED . . . a separate set of tribunals. . . . It was the sovereign and NOT THE CHURCH who authorized the holding of these separate courts. . . . The authority for the jurisdiction of the existing ecclesiastical courts did . . . emanate directly from the crown." And he infers that, "what the sovereign . . . SET UP and CREATED, the sovereign may well alter and amend." Now here, I say, the comment misrepresents the text from beginning to end. Unless lawyers claim to work a miracle on language, you simply cannot get that sense out of those words. Of this at least I am certain, if any modern expounder had so dealt with a fragment of Solon's laws, or of the Roman XII. Tables, he would be instantly hissed off the stage of historical research by an indignant chorus of contemporary critics. It is only where the Church and her liberties are at stake that the alloy of a lawyer's comment is allowed to mingle with and debase the sterling text of a charter.

The next instance is one not of purely legal wisdom, since the names of two prelates were on the back of the "judgment," as it is called, in the Purchas case. Their lordships quote "the words of Archdeacon, afterwards Bishop, Cosin, in 1687," as "expressing the state of the law," *i.e.*, the rubric before the consecration prayer of our present Prayer Book of 1662. As a fact, Bishop Cosin died in 1672, *i.e.*, had been dead 15 years at the date ascribed to his words; moreover, these words are cited from the articles of a visitation held in 1627, being 35 years before the rubric was framed which the words are cited to illustrate! On this mistake being discovered, one of the prelates referred to wrote in the *Times* of April 3rd, 1875, representing that the false date was no part of the judgment, was a printer's error, found only in unauthorised reports and not in the official copies. I say that that statement in the *Times* is incorrect. I speak from having seen an official copy; the date is there 1687. I say, further, that the notes of the sworn short-hand writers verify this my statement. I say yet more, that the defence set up stultifies the argument. For how could words used in 1627 illustrate a rubric which first saw the light 35 years after the words were uttered? I had thought of suggesting to that distinguished prelate, who of course was unaware of these facts when he wrote, and perhaps was not struck by the fact that the laws of thought make the blunder a necessary part of the argument, that if he finds the facts to be as I allege, another letter in the *Times*, to say so, would be a tardy but not unseemly tribute to truth and justice.

In the same judgment occurs the sentence, "In prescribing a surplice only the Advertisements meant what they said, a surplice only." The same phrase is in an earlier paragraph ascribed to the Canons of 1604. There is no such phrase in those Advertisements, nor in those Canons. Their lordships are here guilty of the grossest outrage a commentator can perpetrate, that of interpolating the text on which he comments. They first of all read the long paragraph of the Advertisements touching vestments into our rubric of three lines, they then read the word "only" into the Advertisements (and, as I have shown, into the Canon also), and the trick is done. Mr. Hallam (Constl. Hist., c. viii., vol. i., p. 493) says, "that Jesuit would disgrace his order who should ask more than this . . . . the right of interpreting whatever was

written, and supplying whatever was not :"—exactly what my lords require to make their "judgment" fit the facts. I humbly think, on these terms, I could almost set up as judge of appeal myself. But these Advertisements themselves—on what rests their authority as a supposed Royal Act? On an alleged Queen's letter; neither of the two extant copies of which have either sign manual, or date (save that on the docket of the collector), or other sign of authentication to identify it as the sovereign's act. I refer to the elaborate examination of this subject by my friend Mr. Jas. Parker, who declares one to be a mere rough copy interlined by Cecil, the other a fair office draft of the same, with these and other alterations, and that all known record-collections have been searched in vain for any third copy. I ask to-day, and claim an answer, has any copy with authentication to validate it been discovered? Those Advertisements are the corner-stone of the "Ridsdale Judgment;" of those Advertisements this supposed royal letter is in turn the corner-stone. The whole rests on some supposed instrument of State, the authentication of which is, so far as we yet know, *in nubibus*. It is exactly the elephant supported by the tortoise, which is supported by nothing!

This whole question of the authority of the Advertisements of 1566 is too complex to discuss fully now. I will merely adduce some glaring errors in citation, etc., made by their lordships. Thus, Bishops Parkhurst (1569), Cox (1570, about), Grindal, (Archbishop 1576), Whitgift (1584), and Thornborough (1603), are cited to prove the Advertisements had the Queen's authority. There is not one of these five prelates who does not, in the very words which their lordships cite, clearly and emphatically distinguish between what had the Queen's authority, and what had some other; classing the Injunctions of 1559 under the first head, and the Advertisements under the latter. Their lordships also allege that "Hooker describes the Advertisements as agreed upon by the bishops and confirmed by the Queen's majesty." The fact is, Hooker nowhere names the Advertisements at all. He speaks of "*a decree*" so "agreed, etc." Now if it were more nearly certain than it is, that Hooker refers by a loose and general term to the Advertisements, it violates the first principle of documentary evidence so to deal with language.

I have only touched a very few of the graver errors and blunders which the acumen of legal laymen has saddled on the Church. It would have taken all my time to examine even cursorily the fifth part of them. But whoever will spend a few pence in a letter of Rev. Coker Adams to the Lord Bishop of Manchester, or the pamphlets of the Rev. S. C. Grueber, will find alleged a long list of such blunders and errors worth examining for themselves. Now you are not likely to get a better qualified class of laymen on your permanent tribunal than those who adorn the Privy Council. You see what their wisdom comes to. It would be foolhardy to give confidence blindly after experience had; and where God's truth is at stake it would be criminal. But what is to be done with this mass of blunders, inconsistencies, and contradictions which the old Committee of Privy Council will bequeath to any new court, however composed? In order to prevent such court from being strangled at its very birth in the tangle, the only way would, I think, be to

sweep it all away and start fair. I had hoped to find time for some remarks on the fatal lack of sympathy with the subject with which they deal which these lay lawyers betray—a defect worse than any mere ignorance, because less corrigible, but time forbids. I will only add in conclusion—from first to last the report in every clause ignores the presbyterate and their primary and indelible functions in respect to Church discipline. That the prelates are to efface the clergy, and the laity at their discretion the prelates—the sheep to usurp the place of the shepherds, is a truer description of the whole than can be given in equally few words. I suggest, let the presbyterate of every diocese respectfully but firmly demand that the synod of the diocese be summoned, the bishop of course presiding and guiding. Let them study beforehand the eighth book of Hooker, then examine by committees or otherwise, as convenient, the allegations I have made, and use in this momentuous issue that "great boldness in Christ Jesus" which is at once their privilege and their duty. If they desert that duty at this crisis they will probably see the Church handed over, gagged and bound, to the secular arm, without even the prescriptive prayer, "that she may be tenderly dealt with," and left isolated amid the contemptuous pity of every communion that bears the Christian name.

ADDRESS.

The Rev. Canon Trevor, Beeford, Hull.

In listening to the paper just read, I could not help thinking that the rev. doctor had "come to bury Cæsar, not to praise him." I take a very different view of the learned, comprehensive, and thoroughly honest report to which he has referred. I do not mean to follow my rev. brother into the details, upon which the Commissioners are themselves divided, and much less into those which he tells us never occurred to their minds, and which cannot reasonably occur to the minds of any who read their report. I observe that only one-third of the Commissioners have signed the report without qualification; one-third more have entered reservations which tend to secure (more or less) further liberties for the Church; the rest incline in varying degrees to the other direction. It must be perfectly obvious that these recommendations will never pass into law precisely as they stand in the report; and, to my mind, nothing could be more disastrous to the rising hopes of the Church, than that the discussion in Parliament and in Convocation should be prejudiced by any hostile and perhaps unfounded cavilling on questions which are sure to be anxiously considered at the proper time and place. I prefer to fix your attention on the principles on which the Commissioners are unanimous, and which must certainly govern whatever legislation must take place hereafter. In the first place they lay down this broad principle, that the Church has a law and a judicature of her own, independent of and antecedent to the very existence of the English State: and, next, that the whole purpose of the ecclesiastical jurisdiction is to add the sentence of the law to this original, inherent, indefeasible authority of the Church of God. I should be of all men the most ungrateful not to accept this verdict with profound thankfulness; for there is not one point for which I have ever contended, not one word I said at Derby last year—and my words were purposely as strong as I could make them—which is not confirmed, approved, adopted by the unanimous verdict of this profoundly learned and widely representative

Commission. For see what they do next! They sweep away the whole mass of vicious legislation against which we have been protesting. They strip the Queen's court of its borrowed ecclesiastical plumes. They assign spiritual questions to the determination of the episcopate. They abolish Lord Penzance and his court root and branch. They give us back the old Church courts. They repeal the Public Worship Act *in toto*, with all the novel provisions of the Church Discipline Act, and every other enactment contrary to the principles and recommendations of this most valuable report. They go further—they go beyond the letter of the Commission to recommend that the voice of the Church in Convocation should be consulted. Having made a clean sweep of existing provisions, they wish the Church herself to have a voice in what is to be inscribed on the page of the future. That seems to me at the present moment to be the most important and practical point of the whole matter. Where could the divisions which are between the Commissioners themselves, and whose recommendations, therefore, show some inherent defect, be more hopefully considered than in the assembly of the bishops and clergy, when under the promised and desired help of the Holy Ghost, the two orders who hold a special commission in our Church, are consulting together for the restoration of unbroken concord? What Parliament desires, in reforming our ecclesiastical courts, is to procure a process which shall be cheerfully observed by the clergy. It is by the clergy that all these Acts have to be carried out, and if the new courts are to meet with the same dissatisfaction, resistance, and litigation that we have so much deplored of late years, Parliament will be the first to be disappointed and dismayed. It is quite certain that Parliament cannot next year give the time and attention to the subject which it demands; but if her Majesty's ministers will carry out the suggestion of the Royal Commissioners, and enable the two Houses of Convocation to deal with this report next year, then I firmly believe that all the difficulties which have been conjured up in the paper to which we have been listening, and which may suggest themselves to the minds of those who have not gone into the subject profoundly, will gradually disappear. I believe that Parliament would find itself greatly assisted by the deliberations which will take place, by the resolutions, and I trust the canons, which will be passed in Convocation. This will not be a new course, but the old constitutional, normal action of the union between Church and State. The Church always speaks first, and the State afterwards, either to accept or disapprove what the Church proposes. It was so in the times of the Reformation. In the rejection of the papal supremacy; in the Act of submission to the king; in the emancipation of the clergy from the yoke of celibacy, and in all the various steps by which our Church obtained her freedom; in the establishment of the Book of Common Prayer, the Thirty-nine Articles, and all other matters of united action, it was always the Church which spoke first, and let Parliament know to what its assent was asked. If that were adopted now I anticipate the most successful results. I believe that Parliament will find very little to do except to repeal the mistakes it has made, under the guidance of the lawyers, in the absence of the clergy. If the bishops and clergy formulate their canons and submit them for the ratification of the Queen, which certainly will never be given against the mind of Parliament, no possible harm could happen to anyone. It would be wholly unjustifiable in any man whatever to resist or protest against the authority of his bishop, when exercised in conformity with the canons of his own Church. I repeat, what you have heard me say in Convocation, that I for one will never lift up my voice in sympathy with a priest of the Church of England, who shall refuse submission to his own bishop acting under the canons of his own Church. As far as I am concerned, if such a man there be—and I do not for one moment believe it—I should be for handing him over to the secular arm, without the slightest entreaty that mercy

or tenderness should be shown to him. What can be done in any church, if the priest will not obey the laws and authorities of that Church, but hand him over to the secular authority? Our complaint has been that we have had no chance of showing canonical obedience to our bishops. We complained that the statute law came in before the bishop, and arrested or diverted the proper canonical action. We do not want our bishops to be armed with powers by Act of Parliament beyond the powers the Church arms them with. We want to see the commission of the Lord Christ, which we have been taught to recognise as the guiding star of the people's instruction and happiness, firmly, consistently, lawfully, and loyally upheld. What can you get, what can Parliament get, by hampering the priest, who is the minister of the Word and the Sacraments of God, with all manner of restrictions of human invention? Why should you wish to take the light and happiness out of the soul of the man whose mission it is to guide you through life? Why should you want to reduce us to a mechanical, hide-bound, soulless, unconscientious administration of things manufactured by human law, when you have before you, by your own acceptance, by the wisdom of your forefathers, and the unspeakable blessing of Almighty God, a true branch of the Catholic Church, with all the elements of Divine authority, recognising your own laws, and uniting your Church and your State—indeed, your whole nation—in Christian obedience to the Sovereign who reigns by the grace of God, and who, by virtue of His grace and in the expressed terms of her commission, is also the defender of His faith.

DISCUSSION.

Sydney Gedge, Esq., Mitcham Hall, Surrey.

It is not often that a speaker begins by congratulating himself and his audience upon the paucity of their numbers, but I do so this morning because I know that the reason why there are so few in this room is that the Congress Hall is crowded with Christian men and women listening to addresses on the subject of personal religion. It shows that they prefer the Gospel to the Law, and it is with a decided preference in the same direction that I approach this subject of Ecclesiastical courts. Not that I agree with Dr. Hayman, who complained of the enforcement of the law as a curtailment of liberty. We have a higher authority than Dr. Hayman for the maxim that "where law is there is liberty," and unless laws be enforced they are useless, and the result is a liberty which becomes license. Recourse to the law courts in respect of doctrine or ritual is a very great evil, but it sometimes is a necessary evil, and cannot be avoided. But an evil it remains, and in most cases such actions recoil upon those who prosecute them, and it is my conviction the actions brought during the last few years by those who have been the chief prosecutors in the ecclesiastical courts have done more to promote the principles to which they are opposed, and to injure the principles to which they and I myself are warmly attached, than any other movement. As war is the last resort of nations, so an action should be the last resort of individual churchmen; but as sometimes it must be prosecuted it is of importance to consider what courts can best decide an action when it is brought. Dr. Hayman objects to the proposed court of final appeal on the ground that, though the judges must all be members of the Church of England, they will not be spiritual persons, and he defines spiritual persons to be the clergy. This definition I repudiate *in toto*. I find that St. Peter called all members of a Christian Church, both lay and cleric, a royal priesthood, and I claim for the Christian laity that they are spiritual persons as much as the clergy. We are told that a court is required whose decisions will be binding on the conscience of the clergy. Such a court does not and cannot exist. It's a mere figment of the imagination; conscience must be supreme and above all courts. We can have no infallible tribunal. A man is bound to do what his conscience tells him to be the revealed law of God; and if

any court orders him to act differently he is bound to disobey, only he must be prepared to sacrifice his position and emoluments. He cannot claim these as his by law and disobey the law as declared by any court established by law. What should be required in a court of final appeal is that its members shall consist of persons trained to understand and to decide judicially all matters brought before them, and who shall bring unbiassed minds to the consideratton of the subject. Let me illustrate my meaning by a comparison of great things and small. When a patentee considers that his patent has been violated he brings an action before a court, presided over by a judge who has no special knowledge of the subject. He does not go for a decision to other patentees of similar inventions, or to engineers, or people interested in the matter. No, he makes use of them as witnesses, and a trained judge, informed by their evidence, gives an impartial decision. So in ecclesiastical matters ; the prosecutors, whoever they may be, consider that they have a monopoly of what is right, or, at least, of what is allowable within the Church of England. Is the action which they bring to enforce their own views to be tried by judges of whom, if they consist of bishops and clergy, every one will bring to the trial a mind already made up upon the point which is coming before him? Far better, surely, that the judges should consist of men who, after hearing all the evidence necessary to enable them to understand the matter at issue and the technical terms used, will decide the question submitted to them on the evidence before them, regardless of all other considerations and of consequences. You say that the established Church of Scotland is governed by its own Assembly, whose decisions are final. But I reply, first, that of that Assembly lay men are members ; and next, that if any minister should refuse to be bound by the decision, the secular courts can alone compel him. And then, remember how often the minority in such churches secedes. To Dr. Hayman's quotation from Hooker I reply, "The sovereign"—to use the language of the Reformation statutes—"as the fountain of all jurisdiction, has supreme control over the Church courts, inasmuch as their legal status is derived from the State, and their spiritual authority exercised by leave of the State ;" and Hooker tells us that, "as supreme governor of judgments, the sovereign has an indefensible right to hear appeals from the Church courts, and to decide finally all ecclesiastical disputes between subjects." A spiritual court can only excommunicate, but there is a vast difference in the light in which excommunication is regarded by the excommunicator and the excommunicatee. Obedience to the decree of a spiritual court may be rendered out of politeness ; but if compulsion is necessary—if property or position are in question, and the intervention of the State is required, the State will not lend her aid unless she is first satisfied that justice has been done, and must therefore have the right to enquire into and control the proceedings of the Church courts. There is no mean, to speak epigrammatically, between politeness and the policeman, and I cannot say that those who most strongly object to the policeman have shown most politeness in obeying the orders of their ecclesiastical superiors. Objection has been taken by many persons, and by one of the Commissioners (Lord Coleridge) to their proposal to give the bishop of the diocese a veto upon a prosecution. Having regard to the injurious nature of prosecutions, I am glad of any objection which lies upon the threshold, and thus approve of this veto, but that all may have justice I would guard it thus : The bishop should be bound to give his decision under his hand and episcopal seal in writing, assigning his reasons, and there should be an appeal on either side upon these reasons to the Archbishop of Canterbury, who should give his decision in the same way. I think this would be a sufficient safeguard. Lord Coleridge indeed states that such a veto upon prosecutions is indefensible in theory, but his lordship must have forgotten that in many cases of civil crimes criminal proceedings cannot be taken without the previous sanction, in some cases, of the Attorney General, in others of the Public Prosecutor.

Lord Edward S. Churchill.

It is with some diffidence that I venture to approach this subject. Firstly, because so many much abler men have spoken and are going to speak on it ; and secondly, because it seems almost presumptuous on my part to attempt to review the recommendations of a Royal Commission. It is, of course, impossible to exhaust so large a subject in a short speech, so I propose only to touch on those points in which my opinion differs

most from the report; and only with reference to doctrine and ritual. That our ecclesiastical courts are at the present time in a most unsatisfactory condition is, I think, admitted on all hands; and that such is the case is practically proved by the appointment of a Commission. Since its appointment we have been waiting most anxiously for the report which is now before us. The first thing we notice is that it justifies most thoroughly the persistent, and I venture to say consistent, opposition which has been offered to the judgments of the court established by the Public Worship Regulation Act, and of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council; and further, that it fully warrants the objections raised against the spiritual authority usurped by those tribunals. For we cannot too strongly impress on the public that it is the authority, or rather lack of spiritual authority, of these courts that has been objected to, far more than their judgments. The wearing of one vestment or another is of little importance compared with the authority of the court which decides the question of their legality; and it must be remembered that these courts have also given judgments on questions of doctrine, and have tried to deprive priests of their cures of souls. To the court established by the Public Worship Regulation Act there are five fatal objections: 1. The divided prerogative which deprives the two archbishops of their right to appoint their own Dean of Arches and official principal respectively. 2. It gave to the Crown the power to appoint a civil judge, and gave him a revisionary interest in the appointment of Dean of Arches and official principal, which were at the time not vacant. 3. It robbed each bishop of the right to rule the ritual of his own diocese, unless the parties agreed to abide by his decision. 4. It brought the clergy under a new jurisdiction to which they had never consented. 5. It placed over the heads of the clergy a judge whose experience in ecclesiastical matters had been gained in the divorce court; a court established on principles diametrically opposed to the Word of God and the laws of the Church. This last is perhaps rather a sentimental grievance; but it is none the less true and deeply felt. Now under these circumstances is it to be wondered at that the Commissioners should recommend the repeal of an Act which carries on its face its own condemnation? With regard to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, its decisions have been so astounding and so contradictory that we rejoice that the lawyers have had them pretty much to themselves, and that theologians are not in any great degree responsible for their rulings. In proof of this assertion allow me to quote the following catalogue:—"1. It adjudged the Catholic doctrine of Baptism to be an open question. 2. It declared that in the Communion office of the Second Book of Edward VI.'s reign there was no Prayer of Consecration, though in that book the Prayer of Consecration is in almost identical words with those of our Prayer Book. 3. It ruled the Crown had nopower to create Bishops of Capetown and Natal by letters patent, and meanwhile affirmed that the Bishops of Capetown and Natal were 'creatures of English law' exercised through letters patent. 4. It decided that 'everlasting' did not mean lasting for ever, and whitewashed the heresy of Origen condemned by the fifth Œcumenical Council on the restitution of the wicked. 5. In exercising ecclesiastical jurisdiction it treated of the awful Mysteries of the eternal world in such tone and language as to extort complaints and remonstrances from the legal advocates engaged before it, and to render subsequent apologies and explanations necessary on the part of the chief mouthpiece of the court. 6. On December 13, 1868, it affirmed that the words in the rubric which precede the Prayer of Consecration and direct the priest to stand before the table, applied to the whole sentence; but on February 23, 1871, it ruled that the priest must stand at the north side of the table, and so condemned the defendant for standing before the table. It ruled, March 21, 1857, that the same 'dresses' might be worn as were authorised by the first Prayer Book of Edward VI.; on two other occasions that such 'dresses' were illegal, virtually interpreting the words, 'shall be retained and be in use,' which occur in the Ornaments Rubric in the contradictory sense—viz., that the vestures in question 'should not be retained and should not be in use.' 8. In 1871, it assigned certain visitation articles to Bishop Cosin, as issued in the year 1687, whereas that prelate had been then in his grave fifteen years." (*Sword and Keys*, 2nd Ed., pp. 102 and 103). After such a list we cannot be surprised that the Commissioners should recommend that this court also, so far as concerns ecclesiastical causes, should be consigned to painless extinction. We now come to an even more important reason why a repudiation of the judgments of the court established by the Public Worship Regulation Act, and of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, has become absolutely necessary. These judgments have been quoted over and over again from the episcopal bench, and by some of the bishops have been enforced as "the Law." Now, "the Law" is one thing, the judgment of a court quite another. Mr. Green and others have been

sent to prison for denying that they are "the Law." It now appears that these decisions are open to criticism; in other words, the Commissioners are of Mr. Green's opinion with regard to them; and it is a matter of fact that as these decisions have contradicted themselves, all cannot be or have been "the Law." It has been necessary to clear the ground by these preliminary observations upon the discredited courts, in order to consider fairly the proposals of the Commission. These proposals are:—1. Diocesan courts to be restored. 2. Provincial courts to be restored. 3. Court of appeal to the Crown. In the proposed restoration of the diocesan and provincial courts we have a return to primitive practice, except so far as in the diocesan courts an assessor other than the chancellor is introduced, which seems most unnecessary as well as unprimitive; surely the bishop and chancellor are quite sufficient, without the addition of a third person as assessor. It is a matter for great congratulation that the result of the labours of the Commission and the patient investigation of the mass of evidence brought before them, should be a proposal to restore the diocesan and provincial courts to their original functions. But we have a strange proposal as follows:—"An appeal shall lie from the court of the archbishop to the Crown, and the Crown shall appoint a permanent body of lay judges learned in the law, to whom appeals shall be referred. The number summoned for each case shall not be less than five, who shall be summoned by the Lord Chancellor in rotation." Is not this practically taking away with one hand all that was given by the other? Is it not certain that the first case of doctrine or ritual that comes before the diocesan court will be carried through to the supreme court? Is it impossible to suppose either side would be prepared to accept the bishop's or archbishop's ruling with a possibility of a diametrically opposite judgment being given on the same points at some future time by the court of appeal. Suppose cases similar to the Gorham and Ridsdale cases were brought before the court of appeal, judgment would be given one way or the other, and from that moment the diocesan and provincial courts would, as ecclesiastical courts, cease to exist, as far as concerned the points raised before the supreme court. The next time a case of the kind was brought before the diocesan court the bishop could only say "The law has been declared to be so and so by the five lay judges of the court of appeal, and I have no authority to say otherwise." He would become a complete nonentity in his own court; instead of giving him more power, the Commissioners would take from him what little authority he has, and he would have to administer the law as interpreted by the lay court, however much he might disagree with it. Now we may ask to be informed why five lawyers should be appointed as a final court of appeal in spiritual matters, rather than five colonels, five bankers, or five mathematicians? It can scarcely be asserted that lawyers have a monolopy of wisdom. A man who has studied grammar, logic, and rhetoric, is quite as good an interpreter of language, whether he has been called to the bar or not. But men, if they be lawyers or not, are not to be taken as experts in theological interpretations, unless they have studied theology and canon law, and there is no guarantee that because a man is a lawyer he has applied himself to such study. But we may go further, and say that, in theological contention, lawyers are worse judges than men of other professions, and for this reason:—The principles of civil and ecclesiastical law are not only unlike and diverse, but positively centradictory. Should a man steal a horse or commit a murder, it is idle for him to repent and weep for his crime, as far as the civil law is concerned. Punishment on conviction will surely follow. Should a man vent a heresy or start a schism, on recantation of his fault the Church's arms are open; he is not only forgiven, but received back with tones of maternal congratulation and affection. From these two antagonistic principles at the outset, the streams of civil and ecclesiastical law flow in opposite directions: the study of the one is a disqualification for the execution of the other. (Of course I can only speak for myself, but were I a clergman, and cited for an offence of doctrine or ritual, I would no more plead before the proposed Court of Appeal, or accept its judgments, than the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council.) But if we thus object to the appointment of five lawyers, it is only fair that we should be called upon to suggest a better court. In 1534, the Act which first gave appeals to the Crown (25 Henry VIII., 19), provided a Commission to revise the ecclesiastical law: sixteen laymen and sixteen clergymen were appointed subsequently for that purpose. The issue of their labours was the *Reformatio Legum*. Now let us see what was the advice given by that Commission inaugurated under the very Act which first delegated final appeals to the Crown, as to the method of dealing with those appeals. The appeal is "from the bishop to the archbishop, and from the archbishop to the Crown," and then the *Reformatio* goes on to say on behalf of the Sovereign, "When the cause shall have been referred hither, we desire to conclude it by a provincial synod if

it be a grave cause, or by three or four bishops to be appointed by us for that purpose." (See *Sword and Keys*, pp. 85 and 87). I am not unaware of the existence of the Constitutions of Clarendon, but they are not to my present purpose, unless it be to point out by the aid of Mr. Joyce (*Sword and Keys*, p. 19), how the lawyers fell into the pitfall Blackstone had laid for them. One of those constitutions simply endorses, by anticipation, the principle of the *Reformatio Legum* as to appeals when the important omission of Blackstone is supplied, that is, that they should always be referred to an ecclesiastical tribunal, and that the proceedings should be taken according to the methods of courts Christian. The appeal, according to these constitutions, was from the archdeacon, "process must be had to the bishops: from the bishops to the archbishops, and if the archbishops should be slack in doing justice, recourse must be had to the King, by whose order the controversy is to be settled in the archbishop's court, in such sort that no further process can be had without Royal assent." "The Barons of Exchequer," Mr. Joyce says (p. 20), "missed their way on July 8th, 1850, by taking Blackstone's mutilated extract from this constitution, instead of consulting the genuine copy." The extract ends with the word King, but omits the important words, "by whose order the controversy is to be settled in the archbishop's court." When a question is referred in the last resort to the Crown, the end to be attained is (especially if it be a case of heresy), how the Crown can obtain the best advice in the country for the solution of the matter. Can any sane man think that the advice of four bishops in minor cases, or of a provincial synod in "grave," as recommended in the *Reformatio Legum*, is not better than five lawyers? And it is most important to observe that the supremacy of the Crown is as completely maintained by the delegation of an appeal to four bishops, or a provincial synod, as to five lawyers. One word in conclusion. The ecclesiastical courts needed but revision, and the laws for clergy discipline amendment; and for this purpose it would be far better that proceedings should be taken by canons under licence from the Crown, than by Act of Parliament. This would be much more constitutional and hopeful. As the Commissioners themselves propose the repeal of the Clergy Discipline and Public Worship Regulation Acts, the ground would then be open for canonical legislation.

The Rev. Dr. Porter, Vicar of All Saints', Southport.

It may seem an altogether unseemly thing that one of the younger clergy should attempt to address you at all upon this very great and burning question, but I would venture to plead in extenuation, that, after all, we shall have to reap the advantage of the wisdom of our rev. fathers, or suffer the penalty of their blunders. I may point out that the report of the Commission will not pass into law for some considerable time; probably not into effect until the time when those who have made the report have passed into a better land. I wish to speak with the greatest possible respect of the labours of the Commission. It is composed of men of the highest eminence in the Church—men of the greatest learning, and men who have a profound desire to do their duty for the Church of England. In the same way, it was men of the greatest learning and eminence who took in hand the revision of the New Testament; but, although we regard the result of their labours as a monument of genius and learning, we do not wish to have the Revised Testament ever supplant the Authorised Version, as we do not wish to have this particular report of the Ecclesiastical Commission supplant the present authorised state of things. Some of the recommendations are good, for example, the substitution of deprivation for imprisonment. But I cannot agree with all. In particular, I object altogether to being placed at the mercy of "bishops' courts." It is perfectly evident that the minds of our ecclesiastical fathers are not altogether at one. I will give an illustration taken from this diocese. In 1851, the great Bishop Wilberforce inhibited Dr. Pusey—in 1883, the present Bishop of Oxford urges us to raise a memorial to the memory of the man inhibited by his predecessor. It seems to me that in a bishops' court you would find that bishops' minds vary on some points, and that you may have decisions varying one with another. I had much rather be taken myself—and in saying this I do not wish to show any feeling of insubordination or insolence to the bishops, for if there is one thing a young man ought to do it is to show the greatest possible respect to his fathers in the Church—I would much rather be taken before some unbiassed police magistrate, than perhaps before some prejudiced bishop, with

whose opinions mine were not in accordance. I have no doubt the bishop would do his best to give me justice; but we all have our theological prejudices, and our views might come into conflict. I think it most undesirable that the bishops of the Church should thus be put with whips in their hands over the clergy, instead of dealing with them as Fathers in God. I think such sort of authority had much better be placed in the hands of a civil magistrate than in those of our fathers in God. I object also to the report of the Commission, because it seems to me to annihilate the whole of the precedents of past decisions, and to throw the whole thing into a kind of anarchy. But the gentleman who read the first paper said the final decision was to rest in the hands of five laymen. Now we know not what their decisions may be. I think it is much better, therefore, to "bear the ills we have than fly to others which we know not of." We know not what may be the result in times to come of the legal acumen which these five gentlemen will bring to bear on their decisions. I would rather go by the splendid decisions we have had in the past. I do hope that the Church will not be thrown into such a condition—of perfect anarchy—as the overthrow of the past decisions would lead to. I have no doubt that these recommendations are made in the interest of a certain section of the clergy. I listened yesterday to a humorous speaker at one of the meetings, who told us that he occasionally went to Rome, but always took a return ticket. It occurred to me that he had caught the Roman fever, and I consider that this proposed legislation is meant more for those who have caught that complaint than for the ordinary clergymen in the Church of England. I think that the whole past legislation of the Church ought not to be thrown into a state of anarchy, simply to please a particular section in the Church. Do you wish to have this battle going on from generation to generation? If you succeed in overturning the present state of things, when your five laymen have capsized all past legislation, then we shall agitate for another five to take their places, who may be got to do something to suit our particular views; and so the thing will go on—like Tennyson's river. "Men may come and men may go," but this litigation will go on for ever. For about twenty years we have been wrangling over these law courts, and now we have got some decisions as precedents—whether they are satisfactory or not—are we to continue to go on wrangling? And all on behalf of what? On behalf of certain vestments and other things of a like nature. What in reality are these vestments? I have in my pocket a book written by a Roman Catholic priest. The author of this book says that the vestments of which I speak were originally "the ordinary garments of the Roman people." Are we to have the whole machinery of the Church turned upside down in order that certain people may have the delicious privilege of wearing the "ordinary garments of the Roman people." There are several points on which the Ritual Commission have given very wise decisions, and I hope that whatever is good in their report will be incorporated into the present law. But I trust that a complete reversal of past decisions will not take place. If all the recommendations of the Ecclesiastical Commission are adopted, the Church will get into such a turmoil, that, probably, when a Mr. Chamberlain comes to be Prime Minister, he will get rid of us altogether, as to our connection with the State. Moreover, whatever you do by your legislation, you cannot please some particular people. I heard it said last night, that a priest's responsibility was absolute in his parish, and that the bishop had nothing to do but to give him a word of advice now and then. Will any court please such a man? I heard Mr. Beresford Hope last night advising some clergymen that, if they could not carry on some practices in their church, they ought, perhaps, to carry them on in mission-rooms and other places. I hope such advice never will be followed!

Captain Montagu Burrows, R.N., and Chichele Professor of Modern History, Oxford.

Let me begin by expressing my gratitude to the Royal Commission for having proposed, in their scheme of reform, to recognise the right of the Crown to see justice done in the ecclesiastical courts, and, still more, to insist on the members of the court of final appeal being also members of the Church of England. This recognises the position in which the Crown has been established from the very beginning of English history; and it removes an abuse which has only crept in during modern times. If the Sovereign, as Supreme Governor of the Church, must be, by the constitution of this country, a member of the Church, so also, by every principle of analogy and justice, must be the court through which

the Crown exercises its ancient but carefully limited supremacy. The report contemplates the entirely lay and judicial character of this court. For my own part, I see no reason why the Crown should not exercise its discretion in selecting from the ranks of the Privy Councillors some ecclesiastics as well as laymen; but let that pass. The principle of the Supremacy, and the principle of exclusion from the court of those who are aliens from the Church, are preserved. But while there seems to be no objection to a mixed character in the construction of the court of appeal, I do, with all deference to this very able body of Commissioners, protest against the unmixed character of the two so-called spiritual courts which they propose for acceptance. These courts practically come before us as innovations on the present state of things, and, as such, are open to the very freest criticism. They profess to be proposed on the ground of an elaborate historical research, going back to the earliest times, and a reasonable probability is claimed that, taken along with the proposed court of final appeal, they will satisfy the whole Church, or at least, on the whole, all the parties in the Church. They may satisfy a certain section of both clergy and laity; but as to their being satisfactory to the vast body of the Church, clergy and laity together, I venture to doubt it. I am not here to defend the existing system, and am perfectly ready to admit that the Public Worship Regulation Act would require much alteration in order to make it satisfactory. Before I sit down I hope to notice one such alteration. It is high time that we should have a reconstruction of our system of ecclesiastical courts, and it is quite certain that no one will find such reconstruction exactly what he wants; but we may all make some contribution to a settlement. First, as to the history on which the report professes to be based. There is history, and history. There is a legal, technical species of history; and there is, if I may borrow an expression from the lawyers, an equitable species of history, of a much broader, and really of a more true and accurate kind. I should be rash if I were to question, without further time for examination, the mere correctness of the history given in the report, as far as it goes. Judged, however, from the second point of view which I have mentioned, the existence of the courts Christian of the middle ages should not by any means be taken, pure and simple, as a guiding element, but several other considerations besides, along with that existence. I mean, for example, their comparative novelty when the whole history of England is taken into account—and in the report we are invited to travel over that whole history—their abuses, both as to judgment of morals and doctrine, the frequent if not steady resistance of the State to their action in the middle ages, and the limitation of that action which was imposed, both in theory and practice, at the Reformation, and has been retained ever since. What are the facts? The Church of England, like the land-law of England, was established many generations before the Norman (which was also the Roman) Conquest. The history of English land-law since the conquest has been that of the gradual abolition of the feudal system then introduced, and of the gradual recurrence to the old English laws. The history of the English Church has been that of the gradual abolition of the ecclesiastical system, introduced by the Romanised Normans, and of a recurrence to the old English position, which gave the clergy and laity a joint place in the government of the Church. I say you may as well attempt to restore the feudal system, and require forty days' military service from the holder of every knight's fee, as to restore the mediæval Norman-French ecclesiastical courts. We do not know as much as we should wish about the Church of Alfred the Great and Athelstan, of Edgar and of Knut; but we do know that "Ecclesiastical suits were heard in the hundred-moot and shire-moot, in which the bishop and the ealdorman are said to have expounded the divine and secular law;" and we do know that "the provincial Synods were [at least] occasionally attended by kings and lay-lords." (Report of Royal Commission, p. xvii). We may add that in that Anglo-Saxon and Anglo-Danish Church, both Alfred the Great and Knut issued canons for the Church in their own names; every royal code of laws contained large ecclesiastical regulations; and though the bishop, no doubt, exercised a certain authority over his clergy, and the archbishop over the bishop, it is, to say the least, exceedingly difficult, if not impossible, to distinguish between lay and spiritual courts. On this truly English system, the separation of the courts of the clergy from the lay courts, brought over by the Conqueror and his Norman bishops, was a tremendous innovation. Now mark the consequence and compare the facts. The earlier Church preserved a substantial independence of Rome, the later fell under its yoke; the earlier Church retained, on the whole, the purity of the Faith "once delivered;" the later greedily swallowed every error under which the Church of Rome fell; the earlier preserved the idea and the framework of a true Church, composed of clergy and laity, each in their proper place, without any jealousy or conflict of jurisdiction, the later established the clergy

as a caste, an *imperium in imperio*, a priesthood armed, from head to foot, with a sacerdotal authority alien to the position assigned both by Holy Scripture and the primitive Church. Then the struggles between Church and State, which have torn us to pieces ever since, began. It was under these new courts that the clergy were enabled for many years to commit murder and every foulest crime without incurring the punishment of death; it was under these courts that the clergy exercised the power they obtained, when the Crown was weak, of handing over so-called heretics to be burnt to death by the officers of the State; it was under these courts that Wiclif was condemned, his followers driven to madness, and the Reformation violently stopped for nearly 200 years. Will any one assert that there is the slightest ground for believing that we should even have had the Reformation at all if it had been left to the clergy and the ecclesiastical courts of the later middle ages? I need not detail to an educated audience the steps by which the action of these Romanised courts was resisted by the Plantagenets, by Henry II., by Edward I., by Edward III., and by the Parliaments of Richard II. These monarchs had the support of their barons against clerical assumptions, and of such still feeble middle class as then existed. I need not detail the processes by which that middle class, grown great, backed up the "mighty lord who broke the bonds of Rome," nor stop to show how the decided expressions he used about the province of the spiritualty in spiritual causes were balanced by the enormous power he retained for himself. I need not point out how the Court of Delegates, and the High Commission Court (which for 107 years virtually superseded the other in cases of doctrine and ritual), were both composed very largely of laymen. I need not point out how, since the abolition of the High Commission Court, the ecclesiastical courts have been virtually in abeyance, until, after being much changed, they were called into some sort of feeble life by recent legislation, still less how unsatisfactory that renewed life, such as it is, has been to almost every thoughtful person. I only ask whether we can expect the people who have had such a history, to permit the revival of the old courts Christian, from which we have had such a merciful escape, even along with a lay Court of Final Appeal. Rather let us hope that in any reform sanctioned by Church and State, the spirit of the old English principle, as opposed to the Roman and Norman-French principles, will be loyally reproduced—the principle of a mixed body of clergy and laity sitting in every court from the lowest to the highest. Let the bishop preside in his own court, the archbishop in his. But, sir—I say it with all respect—however much churchmen love their clergy and reverence their bishops, I cannot believe that the Church at large will ever again hand over their ecclesiastical courts to them as an exclusive order. I conclude by expressing my astonishment at failing to find in the report of the Commission the slightest recognition of the importance of the mass of evidence submitted to it upon the working of the bishop's veto under recent legislation. I am not a member of the Church Association. I would even give the bishop more power than he has now in the settlement of all matters for which the law does not provide; but I have read with feelings which I will not describe, the recorded evidence of the way in which aggrieved parishioners have been treated at the hands of individual bishops; and I am not surprised to find that eight out of the twenty-three Commissioners, following the example of the whole body of Commissioners in 1865, have recorded their disapproval of that veto. That such a veto should exist for a moment longer, much more that it should be re-enacted, as now proposed, seems to me, when the public are once brought to understand what has been done, impossible. It is a wholly un-English proceeding. Every wrong has a remedy at law. Let the drastic process of heavy costs be the lesson taught to too-litigious people. The position of the bishop is that of a "protector of the settlement"—to borrow once more a legal term—but what settlement? It is not only the Reformation settlement, but that of existing law. That individual bishops should be allowed to make law is simply monstrous. *Quis custodiat custodes ipsos?* What Englishman will thus give up his rights to a single man? Every diocese would have a separate Use. If no other change is effected, let me express an earnest hope that such an amazing and cruel anomaly as this may at once and for ever be swept away.

The Rev. Dr. BELCHER, Vicar of St. Faith's, Stoke Newington.

THE new Court of Final Appeal recommended in the report, is the unsound link in the otherwise strong chain, and it is most objectionable for these reasons :—1. Because it will make lay lawyers the ultimate interpreters and judges as to ministering the Word and Sacraments, which the Thirty-nine Articles say the Church gives not to princes, and which are given to princes, if the civil ruler assumes the highest part of that ministry—deciding on doctrine, and ordering as to the ministry of Sacraments—such ultimate decision being, moreover, constitutionally reserved to the spirituality by the Preface to the Articles, and having been expressly conceded by Henry VIII., Elizabeth, and James I. 2. Because it is contrary to the Word of God, and to the history of Christendom, excepting for a short time in England, and because it is a monstrous usurpation of the rights of conscience, and of the spiritual liberties of Christian men. 3. Because it is not needed for maintaining the Church as an Establishment, as is shown by the absence of any such Court of Appeal in the case of the Scotch Presbyterian Establishment, whose freedom from State control in spirituals the Church of England must at least claim, and is politically entitled to possess. 4. Because its acceptance by the Church will commit her to a solemn lie ; as, for example, when five lay lawyers may send back to the archbishop his decision that a presbyter has been heretical, and require him to decree to be orthodox a man whom he had just before decided to be unfaithful. 5. Because it gives no security as to the faith, morals, and fair dealing of the proposed lay judges, a security which past and present experience of the legal and judicial professions shows to be needed, and which is absolutely necessary, if they are to deal with the faith and morals of others. I must say that I advocate Sir R. Phillimore's suggestion or reservation in the report—that the archbishop's court, with sufficient legal assessors, shall be the final court in spirituals. I ask what is the moral obligation on us to be bound by concessions in religion tyrannically wrung from our ancestors, when we no longer are bound by their concessions or legislation in any secular matter? Whether they had any power to sell their own spiritual rights may well be doubted, but there can be no doubt at all that they could not sell the spiritual rights of men born 300 years after them. With regard to the Archbishop of York's suggestion to make the bishop's order legally binding as to services in churches, I think that to some bishops no such autocracy could fairly be conceded, as his grace's own dealing at St. Matthew's, Sheffield, most clearly shows. Lastly, I will just refer to Lord Coleridge's denunciation of the bishop's veto, as forbidding a parishioner to complain of being obliged to attend a church whose services he altogether disapproved of. I think that, considering that his lordship has for many years walked on Sunday away from his own parish to another church, and there regularly received the Holy Communion from a priest in vestments, with two boys swinging censers under his nose, it ill becomes him to object to all that (as he does in the report) as "an abject and mischievous superstition."

The Rev. G. H. SUMNER, Rector of Old Alresford : Chairman of the Committee of the Lower House of Canterbury Convocation on Ecclesiastical Courts.

I IMAGINE we are met here rather for discussion than for inflammatory harangues, and, therefore, I shall at once proceed to say a few words with reference to the remarks of previous speakers. And first with regard to the spiritual constitution of the proposed new court, as referred to by Dr. Hayman. I believe it is admitted on all sides that a spiritual court is not spiritual simply because its members are clerical, but that it depends on its jurisdiction and source of power as to whether it can be called spiritual or not. That is a very important point indeed. The proposed final court of appeal to the Crown is essentially a lay court. But because it is a lay court it is not necessarily a non-spiritual court. The Commissioners in their report say that they are insensible of the advantage which might ensue from the report being laid before the Convocations of Canterbury and York. Their words are—"We have thought it right to pay very careful attention to the resolutions of the Lower House of Convocation of Canterbury, at the request of the Upper House. We are also

not insensible of the advantage whtch might ensue from this our report being ordered by your Majesty to be laid before the Convocations of Canterbury and York, but we do not consider that it comes within the scope of our instructions to make a formal recommendation on the subject. We desire, however, to call attention to the original researches of one of our body as to the method by which the Upper House of Parliament and the Convocations were enabled to work together between the years 1529 and 1547, and also in the year 1861-2; and the way in which, without trenching on the legislative power of Parliament, the spiritualty was able to make its influence felt, or to discuss matters of common interest."—*Report*, Vol. I. 4. If that is not recommending that the report of the Commission should be laid before the two Convocations, I do not know what those words mean. And with regard to this, I would refer you to the evidence in the second volume of the report. I cannot do more now than refer you to the evidence of one single witness, in questions No. 3,562-3. There we have the evidence of Mr. Body, who may be taken as a representative man. He is asked whether it is not the case that virtually from the Reformation downwards there has been no court of appeal, with proper sanction, and he says he proposes to remedy this by giving synodical sanction to courts which are to deal with ecclesiastical cases. He and other persons holding the same views, say over and over again, that if the court of appeal is sanctioned by Convocation, they and others will give implicit obedience to it. So I say that if it does receive that sanction it will be a spiritual court, and will demand the spiritual obedience of churchmen. Then, next, with reference to the payment of those who are to be the final court of appeal, you will find that they are to be lay judges who are already paid as the judicial judges of the land, and they will not require to be paid "by the job," as one of the previous speakers put it. But it is said that there is no precedent to be found in history for the final court of appeal. If, however, you read the evidence you will see that a few years ago it was the opinion of all the High Church clergy in the country, that the final court of appeal should be a lay court, because the decisions of such a court would not in any way compromise the Church. It was the opinion, amongst others of Dr. Liddon, of Bishop Wilberforce, and of Judge Coleridge, the last-named of whom seemed to foreshadow, in a letter he wrote to Keble, such a court as that now proposed. Coleridge, in his "Life of Keble," thus refers to it:—"What Keble calls my 'reference to the bishops,' was a suggestion I had thrown out, and of which I still think something might be made, that in order to separate the fact, including the mere construction of the language charged to be heretical, from the doctrine itself, the committee might ascertain the two former, and then refer to a court of bishops to state the doctrine, and applying that to the finding of the committee, certify the conclusion on the issue to the committee, which should be binding on it. This seemed to me a way to give to each branch of the tribunal what it was most competent to perform satisfactorily, relieve the minds of churchmen, and, as far as could be, keep the doctrine of the Church from change. Lawyers will know that my hint was borrowed from the practice, now obsolete, of trial by the bishop's certificate. . . . and also from the practice of the House of Lords to put questions to the judges as to a statement of facts which the House deems to be *cardines causa*, and usually, though not necessarily, to decide the case according to the answers given."* I am aware that Coleridge suggests that the court should be bound to decide in accordance with the bishop's advice, but I do not suppose we shall ever in these days get a lay court to say that they would be absolutely bound by the opinion of the bishops. I therefore venture to recommend to the consideration of the meeting, whether it would not be advisable that the opinion of the bishops should be made public, so that at any rate the Church at large should know, not only what the final decision of the lay court is, but what the opinion of the bishops is on the points referred to them. Before I sit down, let me say one word in sorrow and sadness in reference to what fell from Dr. Porter. I do think it is a grievous thing that any one who is bound by his ordination oaths should say he would prefer to be tried by a police magistrate rather than by his bishop. If Dr. Porter will only look at the recommendations of the Commissioners, he will see that if this scheme is carried out, he need not be tried by the court of the bishop in the first instance, because if he were ever in the position of being taken before the bishop's court, and he was content to abide by the bishop's decision, he would never have to go into the court at all, and the bishop would treat him like a Father in God. I myself had the privilege of being born and bred, not under the

* Coleridge's "Memoir of Rev. John Keble," p.471.

shadow, but in the sunshine of episcopacy. I reverence the bishops, and I think that one of the greatest wants among the clergy of the present day is, that they should remember their ordination vows, and should submit to and reverence our fathers in God.

J. Theodore Dodd, Esq., Barrister-at-Law.

I think it would be a "lack of justice" if we failed to express our thanks to the Commissioners for their report. A great deal of the report is, I think, of extreme value. I need not explain what I approve of in it, but I will point out what I do not approve of in it. The report contains one fatal blot—the dead fly in the apothecary's ointment—which will make it extremely unpleasant unless it can be taken out. I refer to the final appeal to five laymen, not authorised by the Church, but deriving their appointment from the Crown. Laymen can properly exercise ecclesiastical jurisdiction if they have it given to them by the Church. A true ecclesiastical court is one that derives jurisdiction from and is appointed by the Church. The Church is the kingdom of Christ, and He alone is the head of the Church. My objection to the old Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, and to the proposed new court of final appeal, is that it does not derive in any sense its jurisdiction from our Lord. This is, of course, a much more serious objection than that the court may make mistakes or anything of that kind; it goes to the root of the Church's acceptance of the headship of Christ. I contend that this court of final appeal would be infinitely worse than the Privy Council. I do so for two reasons. In the first place, there would be an assent on our part. We of this generation, at all events, have never assented to the jurisdiction of the Privy Council or of Lord Penzance. If, however, we assent to this, we shall be absolutely, consciously, and willingly accepting something which will in reality be trenching on the Headship of Christ. If we do voluntarily establish such a court, we shall be coming perilously near to actual sin. Perhaps it may be contended that my views in some way or other come into conflict with the principle of Royal Supremacy; but I answer, this is not so if the Royal Supremacy is properly understood. There are many mistaken notions with regard to its nature. And if there is a conflict between the Royal Supremacy and the headship of Christ, the Royal Supremacy must give way. The Headship of Christ is not merely a headship in heaven, but also a headship on earth. He is the only Head of the Church either in heaven or earth. It may be well to give an illustration of what would practically happen if this report were agreed to as a whole. A clergyman accused of wrong doctrine would be brought before the bishop's court, and we will assume he is condemned by the bishop. He appeals to the archbishop, who likewise condemns him, and then, because the clergyman objects to the rules of his own Church, he appeals to the five lay judges appointed by the Crown. He may, by means of these lay judges, reverse the decision of the Church. They may declare that the man's doctrine is not so much in discordance with the doctrine of the Church of England as to require his removal from his office—the office by which he is bound to administer the Sacraments. The archbishop has then with his own mouth to say, "I was wrong. I said that this man's doctrine was not sufficiently in accordance with the doctrine of the Church of England. I now have to say that it is in accordance with the doctrine of the Church of England." If we have any respect for the episcopate at all, can we put up with such a thing as this? It has been suggested that the "trump card" is held by the lay judges. It is more than that. We shall have the archbishop's voice and face; but there will be five lay judges inside him. I was going to say it would be the wolf in sheep's clothing; but I hardly like to use the comparison. Again, take the case of solemnisation of marriage with an "innocent" divorced person, whose husband or wife is still alive. The Church holds that marriage is for life, and not merely during good behaviour; as long as you live, and not as long as you love. In the case of a clergyman being brought before a court for refusing to solemnise such a marriage, the bishop and archbishop would have to say, if they kept the laws of the Church of England, that he was not bound to marry, and there would be an appeal to the five judges. The result would be that the archbishop would in the end have to say that the clergyman must marry the two people. If, therefore, you consent to that appointment of these five lay judges, you commit the Church of England to the Divorce Act. Then, how will the lay judges try the cases?

They will try them by statute law, and not by the Bible. You may quote the Bible to them, and they will take no notice of God's law. In a court of that kind the statute law must be supreme, while with a spiritual court the Bible must be supreme. I ask you then, do you want to establish a court which must reject the Bible? I go further and ask, have the bishops or the presbyters power in Convocation to authorise the establishment of a court that rejects the Bible? It is not a question of disestablishment. That is nothing compared with a question of this importance. The question is whether the Church of England is to keep to the Bible or not. Will they continue to be guided by Holy Scripture, or will they put themselves under a yoke—the yoke of the Crown, which is almost as bad as the yoke of the Papacy?

The Lord Bishop of Winchester.

I THINK that perhaps the Church ought to consider that the recommendations we have made to the Crown, although we may not have made the best recommendations imaginable, or reached in them a standard of ideal excellence, are yet the best recommendations possible. A previous speaker has fallen foul of the veto of the bishops. I think that, however, a very important part of the recommendations of the Commission. I took a very leading part in trying to preserve the veto of the bishops in the Public Worship Regulation Act, and I had the good fortune to be allowed to pass it through the Upper House, against the will of the then Prime Minister and of my revered friend the late archbishop. I feel rather strongly with regard to that veto. It appears to be altogether consistent with primitive practice, and has been declared by the Privy Council to be consistent with good law and with good sense, and I am quite sure that it has of recent years saved the Church from many trials. Of course I think the bishops ought to exercise such a veto discreetly, and ought to give reasons for making use of it; but if you take it away you will give very much more power to unreasonable complaints in the institution of suits. Let me now for a moment speak on the subject of the final court of appeal. We all felt the greatest difficulty in dealing with the matter. It was, of course, the great *crux* we had to deal with. Some of us thought, and I was among the number, that if we could establish a thoroughly good spiritual court, as the court of the first instance, and as the court of primary appeal, we should then have the expression of the judgment of the Church thoroughly well provided for, and that then there would be less danger and difficulty in dealing with the appeal to the Crown. An appeal to the Crown we all felt we must have. I most heartily agree with the last speaker, that if the supremacy of the Crown interferes with the supremacy of Christ, the supremacy of the Crown must give way. Christ is the head over all to the Church, and everything must give way to His supremacy. But let it be observed that the Sovereign is a member of the Church under Christ, and that the lawful authority of Sovereigns has always been admitted, both in the ancient Church of the Old Testament, and by the Church of Christ. It is perfectly possible that there should be a reasonable supremacy of the Crown, subject to the greater supremacy of Christ Himself. The only question is, whether we can make the one properly fit into the other. The article which has been quoted does not say that we give authority to the Crown to interfere in spiritual things. It is, in my opinion, a very happy thing that from these supreme courts the Bible is excluded. With all our reverence and respect for the Queen we do not want her to decide on the meaning of the Bible; the court is not the proper tribunal to decide on what the Bible teaches, and therefore what the doctrines of the Church should be, but only the court to decide on what the doctrines of the Church are. If the Bible was to be laid open to the Queen's court, I think that court should consist of ecclesiastics, and ecclesiastics only; but it is because it will not have to decide on the Bible that it is possible it may be a good court. It is asked whether any history can be brought to bear to prove that the Crown had any authority of this kind previous to the Reformation. In the appendix to the report, page 171, the Dean of St. Paul's has shown us that in the Gallican Church the Crown had authority over all persons and powers in the realm.

"Kings of France have authority over the Church and ecclesiastical affairs—

1. As chief magistrates of the State;
2. As Christian Kings responsible for welfare of the Church, and bound to defend and enforce its canons;
3. As special protectors of the Gallican liberties, *i.e.*, rights of a *national* Church.

"As *Head of the State* the King legislates for the Church in temporal matters, gives permission for Church councils, maintains peace, prevents encroachment on temporal power, grants privileges and coercive jurisdiction to the Church.

"As *Defender of the Canons*, he watches over ecclesiastical discipline, represses heresy, makes regulations for Church rule.

"The *Crown has no power over questions of Faith*, but confirms by its ordinances the decisions of the Church, and makes them by its confirmation a law of the State as well as of the Church."

And much more to the same effect, to which I desire to call special attention. We claim nothing for our princes more than was exercised by these Gallican princes during the Gallican liberties—in many respects we do not claim as much. What seems to be needed for this court of appeal, and what laymen will, I think, demand, is that through the court there should be an appeal from every tribunal to the Crown, where the liberties and temporal rights of the subject are concerned. The question was how were we to constitute this court of appeal. The decisions of the Privy Council, which have been protested against so frequently, and against some of which I am inclined to protest myself—speaking not so much of the decisions as of the reasons given for them—have been the more painful to the Church because the court was a mixed court, and because there were a certain number of bishops who gave a character of ecclesiastical authority to the decisions, when the ecclesiastics might be in a minority. There will always be a danger, in a court of this kind, that where there is great legal knowledge on one side, that knowledge will be sure to override ordinary common sense and ecclesiastical knowledge, so that the spiritual element will be overruled by the legal knowledge of the legal members. That is, I think, an unreasonable thing, because we get apparently the countenance of the spiritualty to these decisions, which are really decisions, not of the spiritualty, but of the legal members of the court. The principle which has been adopted is this—that the Crown should be provided with as good legal advisers as possible, who should be members of the Church of England, that their judges should not be continually making by advice to the Crown judge-made law, and that they should not be bound to state their reasons for their advice, but that if they did, each judge should give his opinion separately, so that it should not be considered that the decision was a unanimous decision, and binding on the Crown for ever. It was thought desirable that the archbishops and bishops should be consulted, and I hope that in every important case they will be consulted. I myself signed a reservation that they ought always to be consulted; for if they were, and their judgment was known, there would be no great danger of a supposed complicity of the spiritualty with any wrong decisions of the temporalty. It is said that the sending a case back to the archbishop to pronounce the decree is making the archbishop a mere puppet, and that he would be obliged to decree what was sent back to him. Now, I say that if the archbishop was a thoroughly conscientious man, and if he was desired by the Privy Council, or any other court, to declare that a man who was a heretic was really teaching the truth, he would refuse to do it, and would be deposed from his archbishopric rather than do it. No archbishop would be worthy of his position as the spiritual head, under Christ, of the Church of England, who would absolve of heresy a man who denied the doctrine of the Incarnation of our Lord Jesus Christ. There is a great security, therefore, in sending the case back to the archbishop. Most of these decisions would be decisions *in personam*, not *in rem.*, and so need not rule for ever the doctrine of the Church. The Gorham decision, for instance, was an acquittal of Mr. Gorham, but not a decision that Baptismal regeneration was untrue. The Commissioners have endeavoured to deal as fairly as they could with the legal court of appeal, and although they may not have done the best possible, it would be extremely difficult for anyone to do anything much better.

The Rev. T. E. Espin, D.D., Rector of Wallasey, and Chancellor of the Dioceses of Chester and Liverpool.

The Bishop of Winchester has said, in his calm and kindly manner, very much the things I was desirous of saying on behalf of some particulars which have been objected to in the report of the Commission. At the same time there is one point which has been absolutely untouched up to the present time, and to which I would wish for a moment to call attention. Nothing has been said about those recommendations of the Commissioners which deal with misconduct on the part of the clergy, and

with the improvement of the law for dealing with criminous clerks. I think the amendment of the law in that respect is for all practical purposes very important, and I am not sure whether it is not in the interest of the Church more important than the regulations for determining questions about ritual. If we have succeeded in amending the present scandalous state of the law in the matter, I think we shall have deserved the thanks of the Church; because one immoral, or drunken, or utterly slothful priest does a great deal more real harm to the Church than half-a-dozen who are guilty of irregularity in ritual. I may, perhaps, be allowed to remind you that once upon a time, when some of our dissenting friends approached Mr. Bright for the remedy of some of their most distressing grievances, he is said to have suggested to them a policy which he put as follows:—"Ask for all you want; take all you can get, and keep on grumbling." I think that some of those who have made strictures to-day, on the report of the Commission, are of opinion that churchmen would do wisely if they adopted that policy now. For my part, I think we should take all we can get, and I am not sure whether it would not be a wise policy to go on grumbling; but if churchmen were to ask Parliament for all they think they ought to have—why then, instead of getting all their demands satisfied, they would probably get nothing whatever. I am sure that feelings of this sort weighed with many of the Royal Commissioners. There were various things we thought we had a fair right to, but we abstained from bringing them forward because we were assured by those who are acquainted with the mind of Parliament on these matters that there was not the smallest chance of getting them, and that, therefore, there would be no use in our recommending them to her Majesty. It has been suggested that everything should be referred to the bench of bishops as the final court; but, I ask, would any proposal of that sort have the slightest chance of passing through the Houses of Parliament? would the laity generally be content? and, if this were otherwise, is there the smallest chance that an English clergyman would be satisfied with a mere reference to the bench of bishops when his benefice was at stake? I do not think it would be practicable, nor do I think it would be of the slightest use to propose Convocation or the bench of bishops, or anything of the sort as a court of final appeal. Moreover, if such a thing could possibly be, the State would come in in some form or other to determine questions respecting the man's civil rights. It always has come in, and if any person should think that the liberties of the Church of England have been very much abridged in consequence, I would advise that person to study Jervis's *History of the Gallican Church*, and see how the Gallican Church was at times ruled by the monarchs of France. The Royal authority must come in in one of two forms—either in the form of prerogative or in that of supremacy. The exercise of the prerogative very much depends on the monarch himself and the power of the central Government. If you look at the state of the French Church under Louis XIV., you will see that the power of the French Crown exercised, by means of the *appel comme d'abus*, was vastly more oppressive and capricious in relation to spiritual affairs than anything ever known in England, unless perhaps under the most tyrannical of the Tudors. The supremacy of the Crown in England means, on the contrary, the exercise in ecclesiastical matters of the authority of the Crown under the laws of the land. I was very much surprised to hear some of the remarks which have been made with reference to the report, and I think that the best recommendation I could offer to some of the speakers would be that they should read the report again. When it is said that the lay judges would form a supreme court, and that they would determine the judgments of the courts below, I would point out that we have been specially careful that it should not be so, for we have recommended that the decree alone should be the binding authority, and that a decision should only be regarded as a decision in that particular case. If the decision was wrong, the question would have to be tried over again, because what was decided in one case would form no precedent in the other cases, and if the final court should after all determine contrary to the decisions of the archbishop, the whole thing would still be just as open for argument in the future as it was before. As regards the suggested restoration of a mixed system like that in force before the Norman Conquest—the bishop and the lay judge sitting in assize together—I almost wonder that the learned professor who proposed it did not advocate a return to the Heptarchy. The business of the Commission, it seems to me, was to deal in a practical way with practical emergencies, and this is the spirit in which I would venture to ask that our report should be judged. The question is, have we proposed practical remedies for practical grievances—have we proposed remedies which there is some reasonable hope of seeing carried into effect? If you will look

at the report in this spirit, you will see that we have not only endeavoured to discharge our duty faithfully, as I think everybody will acknowledge, but we have also offered some very useful suggestions, which, if carried out, would greatly improve the present state of things. I had a few days ago a letter from a gentleman with whom I have had no personal communication, and with whom I never corresponded—Mr. Enraght. In his letter, referring to my own evidence before the Commission, he says something to this effect:—If your ideas in the matter had been the law, I should never have been in prison, and my present parish would never have been in the forlorn state in which it now is.

The Rev. HENRY ROE, Rector of Poyntington, Somerset.

I SHOULD not presume to stand before this meeting this morning, were it not for the fact that from what has passed on this platform, it is evident that the report of the Commissioners has not been read and studied. It seems to me that, in the first place, a good many have forgotten of what the Church of England consists. The twenty thousand clergy of the Church of England are not the whole Church. I hope there are twenty millions of lay members over and above the twenty thousand clergy. Now, let me suppose the case of a clergyman charged with something or other in the matter of doctrine or practice. What is the first thing that happens? If the bishop, after looking carefully into the matter, thinks that with regard both to the individual himself and to the interests of the Church, such a case ought not to be allowed to go forward, he interposes his veto, and thus throws a shield over the defendant, and as far as possible keeps the case out of court. But if the veto is not enforced, further considerateness is shown. The bishop goes into the whole case, with the parties before him, not in the diocesan court, but in his own private study. If the bishop thinks there is a case for a monition, the monition is issued, but if not the whole case is at an end. Well, suppose the case does proceed, the defendant may, if he likes and thinks it his duty, make his submission. Again the case is kept out of court, and notoriety is entirely got rid of. What follows? The diocesan court is reached; and the bishop, or his assessors, adjudges upon it. Again, therefore, the bishop exercises his fatherly authority, and in the provincial court we have our most rev. father to give his decision upon the case. What then follows? There is an appeal. It is an appeal to a lay tribunal. And what is it to decide? Simply that justice shall be done. No authority but a lay tribunal would be sufficient to ensure justice being done. A very important consideration is that the members of the lay court are to be appointed by the Lord Chancellor in rotation. They are to be members of the Church of England, and they are to have the power of consulting the archbishop or bishop, of the province, or of both provinces. If one single judge out of the five wishes that this consultation should take place, the court is bound to have it. These are all very strong securities for the defendant. The judges, it is true, may give their judgments without stating reasons, but if reasons are given at all, they are to be given separately by every single judge. In this way, if there were a difference of opinion, and three judges were on one side, and two the other, this fact might be known, so that all would not be considered to be implicated in one opinion. Then, the decree is to be a decree for the one case, and the one case only. And this is the terrible tribunal about which people are crying out so much! For my own part, I see nothing terrible about it, and I hope the recommendations of the Commission will be carried into effect.

The Rev. THEOPHILUS BENNETT, Curate-in-Charge, Chudleigh, Devon.

DR. PORTER wishes me to convey to the meeting, in reference to what Mr. Sumner spoke of, that he meant no disrespect whatever to the bishop in what he said in his speech, but simply that as his bishop was a Father in God, it was putting him in a wrong position to assign to him duties that might be more fittingly assigned to a police

magistrate—in fact, he meant not to degrade the bishop into a police magistrate, but to magnify him into a Father of God. With reference to the point under discussion, I once remarked to the late Edwin James, "Ecclesiastical law is a thing that no fellow understands," and his reply was that I was perfectly right. And as for bishops, they are about the worst lawyers in creation. For what is a bishop? He is simply a priest or presbyter extended, and sometimes extended for the worse. If, then, you refer ecclesiastical matters in dispute to ecclesiastics, you refer them to a very unsatisfactory court indeed, and to one on which I have no dependence. With regard to ritualism, it is only just and fair that it should be put down by law. Depend upon it you will never have a court acceptable to the criminal classes. I am reminded of the Irish drummer, who was flogging an English soldier. Thrice, at the request of the soldier, did the drummer change the place of infliction, and still the soldier groaned under the lashes, and begged to be struck in a different spot, till the drummer, in disgust, exclaimed, "Let me strike high, low, or middle, you are never satisfied." And so you will never satisfy the ritualist, no matter what tribunal you would have for their correction. I will sit down when my ten minutes are over, punctually to the minute, and not like some other speakers who exceed. I say, then, that if I am in my church, carrying on the services of the Church of England, in the old way, as I have been taught to do, and another man comes and sets up a ritualistic church beside me, and empties my church, it is not fair to me. I am sorry the Bishop of Winchester has just quitted this platform, for if he was here, he would set me right if my inference from his sermon at St. Lawrence's is wrong. From what he said about the man of sin (the *lawless* one) in that sermon, I could not think of any one to whom he so specially pointed, as to Mr. Mackonochie—the chief *lawless* one of the present day. With regard to these recommendations of the Commissioners, I think they have come too late. When the Kerry fool was sucking eggs, one of them was so far gone as to have a chick in it, which gave a squeak in the fool's mouth, who immediately exclaimed, "Ah, my boy, you spoke *too late*," and at once let it glide down his throat. And so I fear the Commissioners' recommendations, like the squeak, have come too late. Finally, I hope we shall all be found to respect the law, and that, when the law decides against us, we shall bow to it, and submit.

H. C. Richards, Esq., Barrister-at-Law.

I belong to a profession against which a great deal has been said this morning, but rather as a churchman, but yet a lawyer, I desire to address you. I am glad that the other side of the case has been put so ably and so temperately by Mr. Sydney Gedge, with whose remarks about the enforcement of a decree, and the interference of the State, I entirely agree. There was one point in the Bishop of Winchester's remarks which I desire to call the attention of the Congress to, and that was the idea, which I fear would take many into a fool's paradise, that the decision would only affect the individual case. We may rely on it, that no court of law would allow a case once adjudicated upon, in which such a point as the meaning of the Ornaments Rubric has been decided, to be reopened. Even if the new court, whatever it may chance to be, was ready to pass by all those splendid decisions alluded to by Dr. Porter, beginning from the Gorham Judgment, which has driven strong minds into the Church of Rome, and, if I may put the converse, weak ones into Presbyterian pulpits, when once the court has given a judgment on some definite and crucial question, it will not be allowed by any fresh case to be reopened. Now, although every churchman who believes in the spiritual character and rights of his mother Church must be thankful for the report which has been presented, clearing away so many mists and prejudices, are we prepared to accept the recommendation of the Commission as to the new court of appeal, whether of laymen only, or of laymen and ecclesiastics? We ought to seek to go back to primitive and Apostolic order; and whatever may be said about the Church of Ireland, she has set us an example as to the rightful position and claims of the bishops as our fathers in God. The final court of appeal in doctrine and ritual ought to be the bench of bishops. We are members of an Episcopal Church, and whatever may be our complaints and objections as to the nomination or election of bishops, we ought to seek to replace the episcopate in their rightful and true position. No doubt this is in advance of public opinion, and it may at present be very difficult to secure the acceptance of Parliament to such a proposition. As Mr. Gedge

has very properly stated, there must be some limitations to the spiritual courts; and when temporalities are affected, there should be an appeal by prohibition to the secular courts, by the defendant, to keep the ecclesiastical courts within their rightful limits. This right of appeal should be confined to the defendant, and not to the prosecutor. Instances have been given in recent years of successful appeals to the temporal courts to restrain the ecclesiastical. The bishop's veto must be retained in the interests of peace, for the Church needs rest more than anything, and Mr. Sydney Gedge's thesis that every prosecution has injured the cause of the prosecutors I thoroughly accept. We ought to be very thankful to the Bishop of Winchester for his defence of this prerogative of the episcopate. Parliament has very little time just now for ecclesiastical legislation, and we can afford to rest. I am inclined to put up with the Public Worship Regulation Act, and the Judicial Committee on top of it, rather than to seek a reopening of the question, which would not be a settlement, though perhaps an improvement. I would rather hope on, work on, and educate the Church and public opinion to entrust to the episcopate their ancient and apostolic powers. Time was everywhere, and in all things, on their side, and the less they dragged Church questions into the arena of Parliament, the more progress would the Church make in learning to govern herself in her own way, and by her own members.

The Rev. F. Nutcombe Oxenham.

I wish to say a few words on what I am afraid is the unpopular side, as a very earnest deprecation of that irreconcilable hostility to the recommendations of the report which several previous speakers have exhibited. As a priest and as a Catholic, I must claim the entire and final supremacy of the Church of Christ in every absolutely spiritual question. And I must disclaim any spiritual authority as existing in the existing final court of appeal, or in other lay court of appeal. With these two safeguards, and insisting strongly on these two points, I would say to my brother churchmen, "Do consider whether you cannot reasonably accept what is now offered to you," if one or other of two alterations or amendments will be allowed to us. Let me ask you to consider this. What power is it that you intend to intrust to this final court? Is it a spiritual power, or a temporal power? I ask you to read this report of the Commissioners, and if you do so, you will agree with me in answering unhesitatingly, Not a spiritual power; not one shred or atom of spiritual power, but only this, that if one churchman should fight with another, and should ask for the use of the secular arm to bring force to bear on his brother churchman from whom he disagrees, the State has every right to say that, before the policeman is called in, it should judge whether he is justly or unjustly called in, whether force is justly or unjustly used. At no time in the history of the Catholic Church, and in no country whatever since the days when our Saviour lived on earth, has the Church ever claimed, except under the worst aspects of the mediæval Papacy, to use the secular arm and physical force without the consent of the State. No such claim has ever been made, and no such claim would, I believe, ever be granted. The reason is obvious. If you only want to interfere in spiritual matters, the State will let you do so as long as you please; but if you want to say to a man, "You are a heretic, and I forbid you to exercise your ministry, and I take away your vicarage house and your tithes," it is only right that the State should be able to say whether tha tis a just or unjust decree. There are two alterations in the report of the Commission which, if adopted, would, I think, give us all that as honest Englishmen and devoted Catholics we have any right to ask. You may either adopt the suggestion put before us by the Bishop of Winchester, that in all spiritual cases the lay court shall be bound to go to the bishops and say, "What is the doctrine?" or "What is the authorised ritual of the Church of England on such and such points?" The very sting of the recommendation when it was made to the Commissioners in the first instance, is lost in the recommendation as it appears in their report. I contend that when the lay judges have asked the bishops what is the doctrine of the Church of England on a particular point, they must be bound to act on their judgment. You must give the bishops a real, and not a sham power. The lay court must be bound to act on what the spiritualty say is the doctrine of the Church of England. One speaker said that such a proposal was utterly hopeless, and that no Parliament or court would ever agree to it. I do not think it is hopeless. I believe that Parliament has so great a sense of justice, that as they would on scientific questions take the *dicta* of men of science, so in

this case they would be willing to take the *dictum* of the spiritualty. There is another point on which I think the report requires amendment. Withdraw the Act of Submission of the clergy and leave the Church free to deal with its own formularies, and then it will not matter whether the final court is a lay court or not a lay court. Let me illustrate what I mean. The Privy Council laid down on one occasion that a certain doctrine of baptism was consistent with the formularies of the Church. If the Church had been free, the first thing for Convocation to have done would have been to draw up a distinct statement of what the Church's doctrine was on that point, so that it could never again be misinterpreted or misunderstood, and the Church would then be the final arbiter of her own doctrine or ritual.

The Rev. R. T. West.

I want to touch on one or two very practical points. Mr. Heygate, in a letter to the *Guardian* a week or two ago, spoke of two points which he considered required rectification to a great extent, but it seems a difficult thing to say how we are to rectify them both. Every one who has looked into the report of the Commissioners must have been struck by the evidence of love for sacred things, and the care that the Church should not be robbed of her just rights to be found in it, and I agree that if this proposed final court were sanctioned by Convocation, loyal churchmen would have no choice but to yield obedience to it. But that does not prevent us trying to get some rectification before the recommendations are adopted by Convocation. One point which we criticise is that only one parishioner should be able to make a complaint. Great evil sometimes arises from the idea that every one who is born an Englishman is born a member of the Catholic Church; and I think that a complaint against a clergyman should be made, not merely by a baptised Christian, but by communicants, and that there should be a number of such complaining communicants before the complaint is entertained. I attach great importance to the veto of the bishop. There is a false supposition that we want to use physical force. We do not want to use physical force. We want the power of the Church to be exercised, but not the power of the sword by the Church. I should like to see a final court established for appeal by the defendant, if he considered himself wronged by the ecclesiastical judges. If we could have that, and not allow the prosecutor to appeal to the final court at all, the proposal would be a much better one than as it now stands. Another thing requires amendment in my opinion. It has been suggested, but has not been recommended by the Commission, that the court should always, and not in certain cases only, refer to the bishops for their opinion. I should like in all cases to have a reference to the bishops before a decision was arrived at at all. It is perfectly true that fifteen or sixteen years ago the great desire was to eliminate the ecclesiastical power from the Privy Council; but it was because we thought that the legal decisions ought not to have such an impress of spiritual authority as to bind the conscience. I consider that the decisions of the Privy Council have been founded on policy and not on law, so that their judgments have become judge-made law, and we know that such things are very dangerous. I do think there is something to be said for the lay court. We heard some most encouraging words from the Bishop of Winchester, when he told us that if the lay court required the archbishop to restore a heretic, he would refuse to do so, and I give all honour to the bishop for uttering those words, because they show what he would do if he were archbishop himself. With regard to the excellent speech of Chancellor Espin, I would venture to say that mere recommendations of what the Commissioners thought right, whether they had been carried out or not, would have been very valuable in educating the people, and giving a healthier tone to the feelings of churchmen. At the same time, one is thankful to see the recommendations which have been made, and, perhaps, even if those recommendations should not be adopted at all, the whole tone of the report will have been such as to raise men's minds to the high intentions of the Church. The mere fact of Lord Penzance's being the only one protest against the idea that the Church has courts of her own, independent of those which the Crown has provided, is an important point for us to act upon. In conclusion, I would say that the two things I object to most in the report, are the proposal to allow only one parishioner to institute proceedings, and the fact of the final court of appeal being, as I think, not only *ad personam* but *ad rem.*

CONGRESS HALL,

FRIDAY AFTERNOON, OCTOBER 5TH.

The Right Rev. The PRESIDENT in the Chair.

ECCLESIASTICAL COURTS.

The Right Rev. the PRESIDENT.

THE last subject which comes under discussion at this Congress is that of Ecclesiastical Courts, and the first speaker is one whose name at once commends itself to you in connection with the subject. It is a name honoured by students of ecclesiastical law for more than one generation. I hardly like to say more, but yet I may add that we are very glad to see more than one generation represented on this platform this afternoon.

PAPER.

W. G. F. PHILLIMORE, Esq., D.C.L.: Chancellor of the Diocese of Lincoln.

THE object of first importance is that our courts should have *jurisdiction*, in other words, a lawful commission and authority over the members of the Church.

Can that commission be given by the State alone? Or must it be given by the Church, either alone, or jointly with the State?

Of these three questions, it is unnecessary to discuss one; for churchmen are well content that, as long as the Church in this country remains established, and Church courts have external power attributed to them, the State should join with the Church in giving commission to the Church courts. The question is, Can the State alone give commission? I submit that a commission given by the State alone lacks the necessary element of validity.

No one, I think, can read the New Testament without seeing that the Divine Head of the Church made provision for its government; and that He committed it, not to the rulers of the various nations in which believers happened to dwell, but to its own members. It was to be self-governing. Whether all government was to reside with the Twelve, and with the bishops, as their successors, or whether it was given to all the disciples then and to all the faithful hereafter, may be points for disputation: that it was committed either to the whole body or to its chiefs, and not to strangers, there can be no question.

Courts and Synods are the two means by which the Church is

governed. Clearly, Church courts must have commission from the Church.

Such, unquestionably, was the practice in the primitive Church. In one point our times bear a close resemblance to those of the primitive Church; and for us, to this extent, the question is simpler than it was in mediæval or post-mediæval times; the point being this, that no jurisdiction is now claimed for Church courts except over strictly Church matters. There was a time when they exercised a much wider jurisdiction; and hence comes the great difficulty of setting this question in the right light. The main part of their business was at one time civil, not religious; and they grew to be considered civil courts. But now again it is otherwise, and the claim which the Church puts forward is to a joint voice with the State in constituting the courts which are to deal with the Church's business, and in appointing the judges and prescribing the procedure.

In the face of this claim, the State has asserted its power to create such courts and give them their commission without concurrence of the Church; till, as a fact, all the more important Church courts, so-called, now in existence are without authority from the Church.

The first admission that this course might be wrong was made in 1881, by the appointment of the Ecclesiastical Courts Commission.

In the report of that Commission the growth of the pretensions of the State is traced very clearly. I would only add one or two things to the very able historical introduction which forms the first part of that report.

England borrowed much in the matter of Church courts from France. In France, in the Middle Ages, for a variety of reasons, the tribunal of the bishop was a rival in popularity to the tribunal of the feudal lord. Each had certain subjects of exclusive jurisdiction; but over the wide range of business matters, bargains and mercantile contracts, the litigant might have recourse indifferently to the bishop's court or the lord's—either of them presided over, not by the bishop or lord in person, but by the official or official principal of the one, and the bailiff or deputy of the other.

This was imitated in England; and besides all questions of marriage and legitimacy, all questions of succession to personal property and of tithes came under the bishops' court.

It was conceivable that this court would even claim jurisdiction over any question, if a clerk were one of the parties; while, if the case were one of a criminal nature, and a clerk were the accused, the bishop claimed to take him as his man, his subject, from the ordinary courts of the land, and try him, and punish him himself.

It is manifest that as the Church courts acquired these secular powers and duties, they thereby brought themselves into new relations with the State; and, as the secular side of their business increased, the spiritual side became obscured.

Then came the question of the appeal to the Pope, a foreign prince, mixed up with and influenced by European politics.

We can form some idea of the feeling with which this appeal was looked at, if we were to imagine that the succession to Blenheim or Strathfieldsaye was now-a-days to be determined in the last resort by the German Emperor; or if the same power was also the last court of

appeal upon a dispute between two Oxfordshire farmers upon a sale of some hundreds of sheep alleged to have foot-and-mouth disease; or upon a question whether the extraordinary tithe could be levied in Berkshire; and we can further imagine whether the position would be improved if the German Emperor made a special claim to jurisdiction on the ground that one of the disputants held a commission in the German army, and had some pretensions to be considered a German subject.

By the legislation of Henry VIII. this appeal and this jurisdiction was taken from the foreign sovereign, and given to the English Crown. But I do not believe that there was any intention of giving to the English sovereign any jurisdiction over questions of doctrine, any power to decide whether the sacraments had been rightly celebrated or administered, still less any power to excommunicate, suspend, or depose. The first Act of Parliament speaks of this realm of England being an Empire, and independent of every foreign prince; but, as the Dean of St. Paul has pointed out, the same claim had been made by the Parliament of Paris for the Kings of France a hundred years before. If it be said that the words of the several Acts of Parliament are large enough to give a sacramental and purely spiritual jurisdiction, I reply that the Legislature was not thinking of these cases; that the clergy in their convocations conceded no power with regard to these cases; and that, even if they did, they could not give the power, either then or still less for all time.

This power, of course, extends over clergy and laity; but, as the question is mainly as to its exercise over the clergy, I will add another thing: I do not believe that the clergy were, in the times preceding the reign of Henry VIII. (except, possibly, under the special legislation against the Lollards), tried for spiritual crimes in the bishop's court at all. They were either tried informally by the bishop or his vicar-general in person, with a recourse for them to the provincial synod if they were aggrieved, or they were tried in diocesan synods.

The bishop had two officers, the official principal and the vicar-general. The official principal heard causes and sat in court—he represents the secular side of the bishop's jurisdiction. The vicar-general had no court; but to him, and not to the official principal, fell the correction of clerks.

I do not believe that the legislation of Henry VIII. gave any appeal from the vicar-general, as it certainly did not from the provincial synod, to the Crown. Canon Stubbs points out that the idea of there being a regular system of appeals in trials for spiritual crime was then apparently as unknown as it was, and still is, in trials for temporal crime.

The subjects brought before the Church courts have now been entirely changed. In Henry the VIII.s' time, speaking broadly, they were courts where the clergy disciplined the laity. They are now courts where the laity discipline the clergy.

I think I may claim the report of the Church Courts' Commission as supporting nearly all the propositions I have submitted to you; and the recommendations of that report as to the future constitution of the bishop's and archbishop's courts are nearly all that can be wished. Certainly there is a substantial attempt to spiritualise these very secular courts, and to put the power of suspension and definition in the hands

of the Church's officers. The subject of discipline of the laity is strangely enough omitted from the report; but as far as discipline of the clergy is concerned, the report is so far satisfactory. But when it comes to the court of final appeal, the conclusion is not satisfactory. The report of the Commission shows that the past court of appeal grew out of a corrupt following of the Reformation Statutes, and of a gloss put on them more than a century after; and that the Delegates got this jurisdiction by mistake, as the Privy Council did later; yet the proposed court of final appeal keeps on the mistake.

That court is to be as wholly secular as the others courts are intended to be wholly spiritual; and yet it is to overrule not in temporal conclusions only, but in spiritual conclusions also, the spiritual courts; and it is to do so in a way which admits that it has all the while no authority, and no commission to meddle in such matters. It is not itself to excommunicate, depose, or suspend; for a secular court to do that would seem too monstrous to the Commission; but it is to remit the cause to the archbishop for him to do it. It is to have power to say to the archbishop—Condemn and excommunicate as a heretic, depose, or suspend as a faithless priest, that man whom you, and perhaps the bishop before you, decided to be no heretic, or not to be faithless.

Why should this be so? It is not so in the Kirk of Scotland. There an Established Church pronounces its own sentence without appeal to any State court. It is not so with the other Established churches to which the Commission refers.

If it be said the State must join with the Church in giving authority to the tribunals which are to exercise coercive jurisdiction, I agree. But let it join; do not let it take all to itself; and it does take all, if it takes the court to which either party may finally resort. There are two or three ways of letting it join without having recourse to the expedient of a secular court, which is to dictate to spiritual courts how to pass spiritual sentences.

The most philosophical way perhaps, though a rather cumbrous one, would be to say that the sentence of the Church court should only affect spirituals, that directly a question of money or property came in, the sentence of the Church court should have no effect until the matter had been re-examined, and the conclusions of the Church court approved, ratified, and, in the language of foreign jurists, homologated by the civil court.

A simpler course is for the State to take securities from the church as to the appointment of her judges, and the mode of her procedure, and then give faith and credit to the judgment of her courts. If not, for what purpose is the Church an established Church?

Now it happens that the naturally principal judges of the Church courts are the bishops; first, singly, and then with an appeal to them collectively in the synod of the province presided over by the archbishop.

It happens also, that the State has almost the whole voice—many of us think far too great a voice—in the appointment of the archbishops and bishops. Cannot the State trust its own nominees?

If the State then were to allow the Church to frame in its own assemblies a scheme for the bishop's court, and a provincial court of appeal, giving to both courts such assistance from the priesthood and

the laity as may seem desirable, letting the bishops in whose appointment the State has the preponderating voice, be the principal element in both courts; to frame also a system of procedure, and submit both for approval to Parliament; if the State, after it had approved of the rest of the scheme, were to give to these courts the support of the secular arm and coercive jurisdiction, keeping always in its own hands, and rather adding point to, the weapon of *prohibiton*, that writ so much misunderstood, which is, however, the real counterpart of the "*appel comme d'abus*," the real substitute for the Privy Council; there would be, as I have said, a simpler scheme, but one in which at least the State had its full legitimate voice in the exercise of jurisdiction by the Church court.

I am glad that the weary task of demonstrating the unfitness, as well as the uncommissioned character of the so-called Church courts is well-nigh over. The report of the Commission, and the evidence and other materials it has collected, have pretty well done that work; and I can spare your time.

Only do not be led away into thinking that you can do anything by patching or tinkering. To remedy some of the obvious inequalities and hardships of the present procedure, to add a shred of quasi-canonical vesture to the provincial judge, to make it rather more difficult for the Minister of the day to pack the Privy Council, these are to attack the symptoms rather than the disease.

If Parliament or the Ministry of the day are to decide the doctrines and discipline of the Church, let it be done directly and obviously; and we know what to think. "Legal fictions" have been pretty well extirpated from the domain of common law; it is time that they should cease in the more important region of the law of the Church.

ADDRESS.

Lewis T. Dibdin, Esq., Barrister-at-Law.

There is one thing with reference to the report of the Commission as to which I think there will be no difference of opinion, and that is that it is a very large one. It fills more than 900 pages. But it is not only large in that respect; it deals with a very large question, and, if I may say so, it deals with the subject in a large way. But while dealing with it in a large and comprehensive way it also deals with it under proper restrictions. There is one restriction which ought to run and does run through the Report, and that is that the recommendations and every part have their basis in the Reformation. Archbishop Tait in the House of Lords, when he moved for the appointment of the Commission said, "We do not intend to go behind the Reformation." Of course that did not mean, and the Commissioners did not suppose it to mean, that the historical enquiry was not to be as full and to go back as far as possible. But it is most essential that we should all recognise that the Church of England, if it is to maintain its position, must stand firm by the changes—religious, ecclesiastical, and political—of the sixteenth century. In this respect the Commissioners have redeemed Archbishop Tait's pledge. Now, I want to pass completely over the Historical Introduction—not because it

deserves to be overlooked; on the contrary, if it is not presumptuous in me to say so, I think that the Introduction and Historical Appendix upon which it is founded form one of the strongest proofs of the extraordinary power of research and of the learning and fairness of the eminent author, Canon Stubbs, that he has ever produced. I want, however, to pass over the introduction and to go to what I may call the operative part of the report. You must remember that when this Commission was moved for there were two complaints made against the ecclesiastical courts. The first was that their working was not satisfactory. All parties in the Church, I believe, were satisfied and unanimous upon that point. And the other complaint was that their constitution was defective. That is, perhaps, putting it in a mild form. Now, as to the working of the courts; the recommendations of the Commissioners are very sweeping, they occupy the larger part of the report. As to them it would be presumptuous in me to say much. I will only say this, that as to the majority of the reforms, I believe, and as to the remainder I hope they will work well. They have been framed by a body of men eminently suited to the task they have had to fulfil. Whatever may be the result of this report, the Commissioners deserve the thanks of all English churchmen, and of all English citizens for their work. With that I pass over all the changes in the diocesan and provincial courts, and come to the enquiry as to the constitution of the final court of appeal. This is the central point of the whole matter, and has attracted the most attention. I mean to confine myself to that. I need not go through the objections to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council; we are all familiar with them. The report has advised the abolition of that court; that is a matter of congratulation to a large number of churchmen. Its abolition, it seems to me, is not of very great importance by itself; everything really depends upon what takes the place of the Judicial Committee.

Now, the report has done one thing which I think very good and advantageous. It has dispelled many illusions. One of the principal of these is the synod theory. During the past few years we have heard a great deal of a supposed practice of deciding cases of heresy and doctrine in synods. The courts of the Scottish Presbyterian Church have been referred to with great approval. The Scotch system provides for the trial of their ministers by synods; the Kirk courts seem to be regarded with much greater satisfaction than the Kirk Public Worship. The report, however, has entirely blown up the synod theory. I do not think that very many of those who had studied the subject ever believed in it; at any rate, the theory is blown up now. In so many words the Commissioners find as an historical fact that heresy has been always tried as now, by courts, and not by synods. I was very much surprised to hear Dr. Phillimore state in his paper that the practice was the other way—that the old constitutional practice was to try questions of heresy in diocesan synods. I was surprised to hear that from him, because having studied his evidence, which appears in the report, I find that he was asked many questions upon that very point. He then took the same view as now; but he was asked at last by the Lord Chief Justice, "Can you tell me if in any book of history, or in any book of practice, or anywhere I could find a record of a man having been tried by his bishop in his synod?" and Dr. Phillimore's answer was "No." I do not know whether he has carried his researches any further since then. If he has I think it is a pity that he did not give us the benefit of those researches. I also looked very carefully to the evidence given by Mr. Wood, the President of the English Church Union. Mr. Wood's evidence was very much to the same effect as Dr. Phillimore's as to the synod theory, and he was also asked if he could give any case of a cleric having been tried before a diocesan synod. He had got one

instance, that of John Badby, a tailor, in the diocese of Worcester, who, in 1409, was supposed to have been tried in the bishop's synod. The evidence of that was derived from one of Canon Stubbs' books. But when the Commission met the next time Canon Stubbs went into the witness chair and said that Mr. Wood had entirely misunderstood his meaning, and that Badby was tried, not in the synod, but in a different way. I pass to another illusion, one as to the final court of appeal. I noticed, just now, that Dr. Phillimore said, "I do not believe that questions of doctrine ever came before the Court of Delegates." Of course that is a very important and impressive statement of Dr. Phillimore's opinion; but the Commissioners' opinion is the other way. The Commissioners find that the appeal to the Court of Delegates was a full appeal, and that everything that was susceptible of appeal came before the Court of Delegates. I do not state only my own opinion, but I take that of the Commissioners. They find from history that questions of doctrine did come before the Court of Delegates, or were, at any rate, appealable to the Court of Delegates. But it does not rest there; anyone who studies ecclesiastical history will find that nothing is better settled than the right of appeal to the Crown in ecclesiastical matters. Hooker lays it down again and again with the greatest distinctness; you will find it laid down in the eighth book of the "Polity." The question is important, because it involves the Royal Supremacy. That word is, perhaps, rather ambiguous, for it has been used in many senses, and I should like to say what I mean by it. The best definition I know of the Royal Supremacy is in the Thirty-seventh Article. You will remember that the Article says: "We give not to our princes the ministering either of God's Word or the Sacraments," but that "they should rule all estates and degrees committed to their charge by God, whether they be ecclesiastical or temporal." The supremacy of the Crown is a supremacy of rule, that is the root idea that you must carry in your mind as to Supremacy. The Queen is the supreme governor—not the supreme head—and has supremacy of rule. The judicial supremacy has three branches. The first is one on which we are all agreed—the coercive jurisdiction conferred by the Crown, that is the power of the policeman. The second, which is very often forgotten, is the right of the Crown to permit the Church to use its spiritual authority. The spiritual authority of the Church of course does not come from the Crown, but from Christ, the Head of the Church; but the license to use spiritual authority in any kingdom comes from the King. The third branch is the Crown's right to hear appeals from the Church courts. This is a necessary corollary to the other two branches, in this way; inasmuch as the Church courts use spiritual authority, and that spiritual authority is derived from the Head of the Church, and not the King, it is necessary that the Crown being supreme —having supremacy of rule—should revise every sentence that comes before these Church courts.

I want now to say a word as to what the Commissioners have substituted for the Judicial Committee. They have substituted a court of laymen to which there is to be a final appeal on all matters of doctrine, ritual, and discipline. I confess I am sorry that the bishops are completely excluded from that court and made merely assessors. I know, however, that this is a matter upon which there is great difference of opinion, and it is very likely that a recommendation of that kind would not have met with the same amount of public approval that the Commissioners' recommendation has received. There is one point of the report of the Commissioners as to which I confess I feel grave objection. I am not sure that I quite understand the meaning of the paragraph I refer to, but it seems to recommend that the judgments of the new court should have no effect as precedents, and not be binding in any subsequent case when the same question may arise. I fear that if that proposal is

carried out we shall find that the evils from which we are now suffering will inevitably recur continually. If you have a final court composed of lay lawyers, whatever technical rule you may lay down, you may be sure they will not allow the same question to be argued before them again and again. Now, suppose the archbishop's court should decide a case one way, and the supremacy court should decide it the other way. The judgment of the supremacy court would not be a precedent. I suppose the judgments of the archbishop's court will continue to be as they have hitherto been, precedents. Therefore, future cases involving the same question arising in the archbishop's court will be decided according to a judgment which has itself been overruled. In other words the Church courts and the Supreme court will each follow their own ruling, and you will get a conflict of decision : that I fear, must be inevitably the result of this proposal.

But, after all, the important point of the report is the vindication of the supremacy of the Sovereign as a Christian Prince, and I take that vindication to be complete and satisfactory. Now, the question before English churchmen is, whether we will accept the work of the Commissioners, or whether we will not accept it. If we do not accept it, it is well that we should recognise what is the alternative. The alternative is disestablishment. Supremacy and Establishment are merely different expressions, or expressions to signify different phases of the same thing. The Church is established when the Crown is supreme, and where the Crown is supreme there the Church is established. With regard to the plans of different individuals, of which we have heard a great many this morning, for some organisation of the court different from that recommended by the Commission, I would say this :—Do not let us deceive ourselves with the notion that any individual, or any number of individuals, can create a court which would have a wider acceptance, or come with greater authority than that of the Commission. It is quite within the power of any considerable body of English churchmen to prevent the recommendations of the Commission being carried out ; but it is not within the power of any body or any party to substitute for the recommendations of the Commissioners a scheme of their own making, and to get it adopted. I do not underrate the difficulties caused by the present constitution, and still more the threatened constitution of the House of Commons. But I would urge upon churchmen that we should not go to meet difficulties half-way. Those who are always talking about godless Parliaments, and the Erastian State are among the most effective allies the Secularists and the Liberationists can have. The dangers we fear may come upon us, but very likely they may not, and therefore do not let us meet them half way. I remember particularly at the time of the Irish Church agitation, it was considered a very decorous and orthodox way of finishing a speech on Church and State to bring out the "Grand Old Ship" of the Church of England and to appeal to the audience not to desert her. Now, I want to incorporate in my speech the "Grand Old Ship," and to appeal to you not to desert her. But I would add this : if you haul down the colours of the ship, if you haul down the Royal Standard from the masthead, if you paint out the old name and paint in a new name you are as really betraying the colours and deserting the ship as if you take to the boats and forsake her. I believe we owe to the Royal Supremacy much of that freedom from revolutionary change and that steadfastness in the ways of sober truth and devoted labour which have hitherto been notes of our Church. By vindicating the Supremacy, the Commissioners have done a great deal towards preserving intact—and I pray God we may be able to hand it on unimpaired to our children—the noble heritage of a Reformed Church established in a Christian kingdom.

DISCUSSION.

James Parker, Esq., Oxford.

I MUST not take it for granted, I think, that every one has read the report of the Commission; and as I do not propose to run through it in the few words I have to say, I think the best way in treating this subject is to take one part of the report and confine myself to it. There is in the report a recommendation respecting the final court of appeal, which I think is the one question which more nearly concerns us in the present state of affairs. The passage I allude to runs as follows:—"The function of such lay judges" (for the final court of appeal is to consist of five lay judges) "as may be appointed by the Crown to determine the appeal is not in any sense" (mark those words)—"to determine what is the doctrine or ritual of the Church, but to decide whether the impugned opinions or practices are in conflict with the authoritative formularies of the Church in such a sense as to require correction or punishment." Although we may all agree with that in theory, the question really is—is it possible in practice? There is the further question, viz., whether, in respect of this series of valuable recommendations which the Commission have put forward, they have sufficiently hedged round those recommendations so as to attain the end they propose to attain. I venture to say I am afraid that they have not. There is one line I will read with regard to the recommendations as to those five judges, which I think will explain what I mean—"The judges shall not be bound to state reasons for their decisions." How, then, are we possibly to know how far their decision trenches upon the spiritual question, or how far they are limited to the legal aspect? I venture to think that that is a flaw; and further, I venture to think that that flaw is made still more clear to us by the following suggestion which they make. "But if they do so" (that is, if they give their reasons), "each judge shall deliver his judgment, separately as in the Supreme Court of Judicature and the House of Lords." This seems to me like filling up small gaps, and leaving open a very wide gate. I think that it is impossible for us as Englishmen to be satisfied when there is a compact of this kind that we should not have the means of judging whether that compact is or is not carried out. As an illustration, to show how very closely what is called law, and the results of the decisions derived from the so-called law of judges are allied, let me take one simple instance. Every one has heard of it—it is in every one's mind—viz., Did the Advertisements supersede the Act of Parliament? Now, with regard to the reasons given, it has been only satisfactory so far that we have had something of a reason given. But I venture to say this—and I have considered for some time whether or not I should say it, and, therefore, it is not an off-hand statement—I venture to say, if this had been the decision of one judge, he would not have written this reason. The words are:—"It is not disputed that these Advertisements were issued with the advice of the Metropolitan, and, indeed, also with the advice of the Commission for Causes Ecclesiastical." No one person would have written that, because he would know it was not true. But because it comes from an unknown source—I mean when I say an unknown source, that there were some who agreed and some who did not; and we do not know who were on one side, or who on the other—no one questions its truth. And this is the point upon which all hinges. We do not know how this came about. In all probability, some one wrote that it was by the authority of the Metropolitan (according to the terms of the clause). But the Metropolitan's name, in all copies of the document in question, is bracketted with several other names, so it was necessary to add the words, "and, indeed, also with the advice of the Commissioners." And what was probably first written was, "with the advice of the Commissioners appointed under the Great Seal," which words were an important part of the clause. It was, however, necessary to leave the last five words out, because it was found that three out of the five Commissioners who signed the Advertisements were not Commissioners under the Great Seal. So they were obliged to falsify their reason—I do not know of whom I am speaking, for the names of those who were directly responsible were all kept secret—in order to make it appear to fit in with the words of the Act, and also to agree with the judgment they wished to give. What we have to do in future is to avoid any action of that kind. I do not say that all this was done purposely. Far from it. We know very well what is often the result of committees putting their heads together. It is to bring out something which no single member of the committee would agree to. I think, then, that this is a very practical matter with regard to the action of those five judges which are appointed. It ought to be hedged round with every conceivable barrier, so

that they should not trench upon the spiritual decisions of the courts below, but confine themselves wholly and entirely to the legal question, which is what the Commissioners propose should be done. I only say that I do not think that they have been sufficiently guarded over the matter to get this carried out. There is one other question I would touch upon, and I do so with some diffidence, because it may be called a sentimental question. But sentimental questions are often very important, and sentimental grievances are often, not only real grievances, but they are the most real grievances of all. In this case we are to have an appeal upon a spiritual matter from a spiritual court to a court wholly appointed by the Crown. Whatever may be the practical working of that—whether it will work for good or for ill—I think there is upon the face of it something which puts the Church in a lower position than it ought to occupy. With respect to the obedience that is paid to the Prayer Book, my belief is, that it is not only because it is attached to an Act of Parliament, but because Convocation passed that Prayer Book, and the State added it to the Act. It is because it was a conjoint responsibility. And it seems to me that the Commissioners—I do not profess to be able to point out how it could be arranged myself—but it does seem to me that the Commissioners in their report might have made some suggestions, at least as to the same provisions that there are in the preamble of that Act, viz., that the Sovereign, with the advice, for instance, of the lords spiritual in Convocation assembled, might appoint that particular court. Then, I think that something might possibly come out of it; and that churchmen might accept it. And if sufficiently hedged round with what I have roughly suggested, it might work well, and to the satisfaction of all concerned.

The Right Rev. Bishop Perry.

I do not wish, nor would the time allow me, to discuss the general subject of Ecclesiastical courts, upon which Dr. Phillimore has read a paper; nor to enter into the general subject of the report of the Ecclesiastical Commissioners, upon which my friend Mr. Dibdin has just spoken. But I wish to notice only, as Mr. Parker thinks advisable, one or two points. Before, however, doing so, I would express my personal satisfaction that I have never been a member of any of those committees of which Mr. Parker spoke, and which he says would as a body do what no one upon them would do individually. My experience of committees has not been such as that; and I hope and believe that a better knowledge of the judges who sit together in our courts would alter his opinion as to the principles of their conduct. I will now pass on to two points upon which I wish to speak. The first is the retention of the episcopal veto. And here I would beg of you not to misunderstand me as intending to express any condemnation of what has been done by any bishops in the exercise of that veto. The bishop who possesses a veto is bound to use it at his own discretion; and we are bound to believe that in every case in which a bishop has exercised it, he has done so according to his own conscientious judgment. But I say—and I am not expressing only my own opinion, but what is the opinion of the Archbishop of York, and of the Lord Chief Justice (Lord Coleridge)—that it is very unwise and very wrong to give that veto to the bishop of the diocese. I am expressing my own opinion, and those to whom I am speaking are at liberty to retain their opinion, but in this Congress we are at liberty to express our opinions. My reasons for objecting to this veto are, first, that our bishops are necessarily men of different characters and of different opinions. One bishop may have been, or may be, a member of the English Church Union. I was going to add, perhaps a member of the "Confraternity of the Blessed Sacrament." Another bishop may be, or may have been, a member of the Church Association. I am only mentioning a fact. I am not saying which is right or wrong, only that all alike will be compelled to exercise a discretionary power; and that, as the Prime Minister appoints the bishops, we shall have one bishop representing one body, and another bishop another body, and, therefore, in similar cases, the two will probably come to different conclusions. Therefore I do not think that the veto ought to be intrusted either to one or the other. My second reason is that it is very hard upon a bishop to have such a responsibility put upon him. It is not, as it seems to me, within the scope of his office. You will observe that it is the power of preventing the decision of a legal question, or of depriving a person who considers himself injured by the illegal conduct of a clergyman, from taking measures to put an end to that conduct. The other point I wish to speak upon is, the injunction that clergymen,

when they doubt or diversely take any thing in the Prayer Book, should refer the question to the bishop. That injunction is now never acted upon. But it was suggested by the Archbishop of York, and I think very wisely suggested, that it should be made compulsory; and that, if any question arose as to the conduct of a particular clergyman, it should be first of all referred to the bishop for his decision, and, until an appeal was made from that decision, it should be valid and be enforced. I firmly believe—and I may speak to a certain extent from my own experience—that if this were the case, a great number of the present painful disputes would be at once put an end to; for most persons would readily submit to the decision of a bishop rather than appeal to the judgment of an ecclesiastical court. There is one other remark I would make with reference to a statement that, until the recommendations in the ecclesiastical report are agreed upon, and a new court constituted, no judgment of any existing ecclesiastical court should be acted upon. That is to say, until a time, which probably will never come, when Parliament shall have passed an Act adopting these recommendations, we are to remain in the state in which the Israelites were in the wilderness, each man acting according to the devices of his own heart, without any law at all. Now, my friends, addressing you as a body of English churchmen, I would say that I very much object to many of the practices now prevalent amongst us, and very much dread the consequences of them; but that I dread very much more the consequences of a state of lawlessness which hereafter, at no distant period, would be destructive of our Church. By lawlessness, I do not mean what my friend Mr. Berdmore Compton spoke of in his speech last evening—the transgression of some particular of the Act of Uniformity; but I mean the persisting in the continuance of a practice which has been legally condemned; and that, notwithstanding the bishop—which is very often the case, for bishops have complained to me of it—has distinctly required the offending clergyman to give it up. I call this a state of lawlessness; and the continuance of such a state, if it does continue, will, I believe, be destructive of our Church. I therefore earnestly hope that the suggestion that no judgment of the existing courts should be carried out, but the law of the Church should remain in abeyance until the recommendations of the Commission have been adopted by Parliament, will not be acted upon by our Ecclesiastical rulers.

The Rev. Henry Fletcher.

The Blue-book which is in my hands contains, I believe, no greater treasure for the English Church and nation than the two Acts of Parliament passed in the 24th and 25th years of the reign of King Henry VIII. Many in this hall have long been acquainted with the opinion of one who is no small authority in matters appertaining to the constitutional history of England—I mean the present Prime Minister of England. There are many in this hall who have been long acquainted with his opinion that the present final court of appeal in ecclesiastical matters is an unconstitutional court. That opinion, early embraced, has been maintained by that high authority, and clung to with a tenacity which has not always, I am sure, in the opinion of many here, characterised other opinions which he has expressed. That which once deserved the name of an opinion now deserves the name of a conviction. That conviction has been confirmed by a study which he had greater opportunities of following than up to this year has been within the reach of most of his fellow-countrymen. The report of the Commissioners of the constitutional working of the ecclesiastical courts contains the Acts of 24th and 25th of King Henry VIII. in full. There might up to this day have been persons who suspected that the conclusions drawn from Mr. Gladstone's pamphlets were but ill-supported, that they rested upon extracts detached from their context. It will be no longer possible, I think, for anyone to maintain that until they have read through the whole of the Acts of the 24th and 25th of King Henry VIII., as I hope they will. Those Acts enable us to mark the exact moment when the liberties of England, in the matter of appeal, were recovered from the foreign and unrighteous authority. They have in my hearing, and, I suppose, in the hearing of others, sometimes been called the Great Statutes of the Reformation. I do not think they deserve that epithet in any other sense than as the seller of two razors—one of which had been made to sell and the other to shave—would be entitled to call them a good pair of razors. The 24th Act of King Henry VIII. I believe to have been an admirable Act, recovering the liberties of every state of the realm of

England. The 25th Act of King Henry VIII. I believe encroached upon the liberties which had been secured by the 24th Act of that reign. The Act of the 24th year of King Henry VIII. is entitled an Act for the Restraint of Appeals. The Act of the 25th year of King Henry VIII. is not called an Act about appeals, but it deals with appeals—it is called "an Act for the Submission of the Clergy," but it really deals with the matter of extending appeals both in the subject matter to be appealed from, and in the number of courts of appeal. And it is in this matter true of courts of appeal, which are constituted under that Act, that I believe the first great breach in the constitution of England was affected almost at the very moment of its restoration. Do you ask for proof of such an assertion as this? I answer that that proof is to be found in the language of the 24th Act of King Henry VIII., as compared with the language of the 25th Act of that reign. In the recital which opened the Act of the 24th year of that reign the King makes mention that divers of his noble ancestors had made divers good laws and rules for the maintenance of the prerogative, the authority, and the dignity of the Crown of England, and of the jurisdiction spiritual and temporal for the conservation of all of these. They had regard not only to the dignity, but to the conservation of the liberties of their subjects in the matter of obtaining from the throne by the civil jurisdiction which were proper to the civil matters in debate. The King and the Parliament, in the 24th year of the reign of King Henry VIII., obtained the liberation from the foreign dominion of these jurisdictions. In the 25th year of that reign, in an Act of Parliament, there appears a new phrase. Those jurisdictions spiritual and temporal are no longer preserved, but this phrase occurs—"For lack of justice in any of the ecclesiastical courts it shall be lawful to appeal to the Crown"—as though the ecclesiastical courts had not been for 500 years before the proper courts—the constitutional courts—in which the Crown of England had administered justice to its subjects in Parliamentary matters. Had there in that one year been proved to have been such lack of justice in the ecclesiastical courts as to demand that there should be a temporal court appointed by the King to review, and possibly to reverse their judgment? A clear constitutional breach was here effected, and I believe that the report justifies to the uttermost the reservation of Sir Robert Phillimore, and that the true mode for ever of the Crown of England administering justice in spiritual matters is in the spiritual court. The report has, indeed, strengthened in many valuable particulars the spiritual courts. It proposes that henceforth the spiritual courts should be strengthened, and, I believe, in the widest manner; but that "strengthened" is but an illusion—nay, I might almost say, it is an insult to the spiritualty, for after all that strengthening the judgment of the ecclesiastical court is liable to be reviewed, and possibly to be reversed by a temporal court. The archbishop of the province, who has solemnly pronounced his own judgment and his bishop's judgment on the matter in dispute, is, forsooth, to have his judgment reversed by a temporal court, and he is to be obliged, sitting again in his own court, to utter a sentence contrary to his own judgment.

The Ven. W. Emery, Archdeacon and Canon of Ely, Permanent Secretary to the Church Congress.

I desire, with his lordship's permission, to give a brief explanation with regard to a statement of mine yesterday morning, as to the teaching in the Ladies' Colleges at Cambridge and Oxford. This morning, the following statement has been sent me from the secretary of Girton College, which she thinks should be made known, to remove the impression which my speech is supposed to leave, "that religious instruction did not form a part of the college course, that there was no distinct recognition of the Church and its particular principles, and the prevailing tone of thought amongst the students was sceptical." The statement, which I will read, does not touch really the special point I had in view yesterday, and to which I desired to call distinct attention, viz., that, save in Lady Margaret's College, which is under a special Church Council, like Keble and Selwyn, there is practically no security as to the Church of England character and teaching, however excellent and sound may be the religious teaching and superintendence of individual instructors from time to time. The statement sent is this, that "the Universities, being now open to all

persons, *all* the colleges for women—Girton, Newnham, Somerville Hall, and Lady Margaret's, are founded on the same open basis. Divinity is studied at Girton as one of the subjects of the college course. A reference to the class list for last year will show that one of the students of Girton has a place in Class III. of the Theological Tripos. The rules of Girton include this one: 'Religious instruction and services, in accordance with the principles of the Church of England as by law established, shall be given and held in the the said college.' The Rev. A. H. Cooke, of King's College, Cambridge, can speak as to the large attendance at these services, and the generally religious tone of feeling prevailing throughout the college. The reply of one student, as to whether sceptical opinion was prevalent among the students, is 'Decidedly not—we have *outgrown all that* at Girton; the tendency is to religious faith and observance.' Another, in answer to the question of the influence of Girton on her own opinions and character, replies, 'My own religious convictions and spiritual life were greatly strengthened and deepened by three years at Girton, as well as my love for and appreciation of the principles and practice of our own Church.' Much more testimony of this kind from other students could be given if time permitted."

The Very Rev. RANDALL T. DAVIDSON, Dean of Windsor.

IT would certainly ill become me to attempt an elaborate criticism, either of the report which has been so much spoken of to-day, or of the criticisms upon that report which have been brought before you by the learned gentlemen who have already addressed you. I have a different aim. I am not here to praise or blame the report in detail, but to recommend its ready acceptance, not merely because of the conclusions at which it has arrived, but because of the mode by which those conclusions have been reached. It does seem to me scarcely less than providential that, at a crisis when so much was expected, or rather, one may say, when so much was desired, and perhaps by many so little was expected, a report should have been first drawn up under the guidance, though not under the actual hand of the archbishop, who, whatever else may be said, had at least the power of conciliating the English laity, and that it should have been presented to the world under the chairmanship of the archbishop who preached the opening sermon at this Congress. But the report has its strength not merely because of the names which are appended to it, but because of the infinite labour expended by those men in the drawing up of that report. Perhaps no one has had a better opportunity than I of knowing from outside the amount of work, of wear and tear, involved in the attendance of busy men at those seventy-five meetings, which, after all, formed but a small proportion of the real labour which was undertaken by the members of that Commission. Now, what I want to ask is, that to those names and that labour may be accorded their proper weight and value; that this report may not only be taken with the respect which is due to it—that is a matter of course—but that it may be taken with something more than that. Do not suppose that I desire to deprecate legitimate discussion of its details. The very object of our meeting this afternoon is to bring about such criticism. But I want to say this—do remember that that criticism is a very responsible thing, that it does matter very much how the report is criticised, and what people do and say about it. Those who publish their criticisms of what the report contains, and of what they think it ought to contain, should have had some previous knowledge of this very intricate subject, or should at least have made themselves masters of the two large Blue-books they are criticising. In almost every newspaper there have been letters dealing with the report. Those who write those letters are all, no doubt, very estimable persons. Many of the names appended to the letters are names which would carry great weight anywhere; but there are, in some of the criticisms so launched upon the world, traces that the writer supposes that he is gifted with some preternatural power of vision, which enables him to see what has escaped the notice of everyone else, or that he has such inspiration as to be able to reveal to everybody some new theory which cannot have occurred to anyone before. Those kind of criticisms usually begin with the formula—"Apparently it did not occur to the Commissioners," so-and-so. When one sees such criticisms, one is inclined to suggest that the critic should read over carefully the names of the members of that Commission; that he should consider what is the wealth of the experience which that list of names contains; what are the varied responsibilities that these men

have had in past years, and that he should turn these and kindred subjects over in his mind before taking his pen in hand. Then let him turn again to the Blue-books themselves. The secretary of that Commission—a gentleman as to whom I know the Commissioners themselves would be ready to acknowledge how much the country is at this moment indebted to him—would be able to refer nine-tenths of those critics to some page or other of the report, and to show them that the very points they are raising have been fully and carefully discussed. In so speaking of the report, I include, of course, the evidence, for a very large proportion of the evidence is in the nature of an elaborate discussion. And it is certainly true—I can speak from having myself tested it—that a large number of the criticisms which have been brought before the world as something perfectly new, and never thought of before, refer to matters which are to be found printed, to the extent of perhaps half a column in length, in the Blue-book. There is one other point I wish to speak of. It has hardly been touched upon by previous speakers. The Commissioners had to consider not merely what they or other people would like, but what they or other people could get. We have to consider, in a report of this kind, not our *à priori* idea of a good Church and a good court, but practically what in these days, and in this land of England, could be got for the Church we love, and want to make as good as we possibly can. It is a very easy thing, and, perhaps, for the performers, it is a very pleasant thing, either in newspapers, or upon platforms, to draw up brand-new constitutions for Church courts. But that was not what the Commissioners had to do. And, remember, it is always possible to raise hypothetical cases, which would cause great difficulties in any conceivable scheme that any body of men could devise. We have heard a great deal of objection of that sort of late. It is impossible for any Commissioners to lay down a scheme to which no hypothetical objection could be imagined. But in the report of the Commissioners we have a plan given to us which is deliberately intended for the existing state of things, in order to meet difficulties which have been fully and candidly stated by a very large body of witnesses. These recommendatiens are given to us as the result of infinite labour; they are given to us with all the weight of names which ought to command universal respect. What I say, then, about these recommendations, is this: let us take them as they are, and be thankful for them. The criticism of which I speak is not merely responsible—it is very dangerous. Of course it is the duty of those who can really see, and have found out blots in the recommendations, to point them out, and for this I am sure no one will be so grateful as the authors of the report. But the task is both responsible and dangerous. There is absolutely nothing which the enemies of our Church, and of peace in our Church, so much desire respecting this report, as to be able to say that it has not the assent and approval of churchmen at large. It will be a responsible task indeed which will devolve upon those who have to introduce in Parliament any measure founded upon this report. When they bring it forward, let their hands be strengthened instead of weakened. We should help them, so as to enable them to go forward with their difficult task, not with the certainty that men will rise on every side primed with extracts from Church and secular papers professing to give expression to the views of a large body of churchmen who object to the report. No; enable them to come before the Legislature and say that the report has been before the eyes of England for so long, and that, taking it all in all, it has been favourably accepted by the Church at large. Let them ask the Houses of Parliament to accept this report—to give it validity, because it will bring about the peace of the Church we hold so dear, and because it is the voice, not only of the Commissioners, but the practically unanimous voice of the Church of England at large.

The Rev. R. W. Randall, All Saints', Clifton.

I hope I shall disappoint no one in this hall when I say that I have asked leave to read what may be of some great use to us in the important consideration upon which we have entered this afternoon—viz., a paper found among my late father's possessions, which has fallen into my hands. Every well-weighed conclusion in this paper comes, I think, to strengthen the most weighty determinations of the Ecclesiastical Courts Commission. I will now read the following remarks of the late Archdeacon James Randall on Archbishop Tait's *Preface to Ecclesiastical Judgments by the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council*:—

"The Bishop of London's preface to the collection of judgments of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council in ecclesiastical cases relating to doctrine and discipline has two objects. *First*, to show that the Crown, as representing the State, is, of right, the judge by way of appeal in the last resort of all causes ecclesiastical. *Secondly*, that the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, as at present constituted, if not the best possible court through which the Crown could exercise its appellate jurisdiction, is at least so good for that purpose that no change in it is required.

"It is not necessary here to discuss the first point at any length. It will be admitted on all hands that, according to the Constitution of the Church and Realm of England, the Crown is in all causes, ecclesiastical as well as civil, supreme. Yet, when we come to inquire how, and by what machinery, the supremacy in causes ecclesiastical ought to be exercised, we must look a little into the ground on which this latter supremacy rests, and inquire whether it is so absolutely complete and independent as the civil supremacy is.

"By the Constitution of England, the Church of England is a part of the political organisation of the kingdom. But the Church of England is also a part of a much wider and higher organisation, namely, of the Church universal, of which Christ is the Head, and His laws are the laws, not to be superseded or modified by any human jurisdiction. And if the Church of England were knowingly and wilfully to agree to or acquiesce in any such supersession or modification of Christ's law, she would be guilty of rebellion against Christ, the Head of the Church universal, and might even, by persistency of disobedience, cast herself wholly off from the Body of Christ. This, also, it may be presumed, will be admitted on all hands.

"Whenever any State takes a branch of Christ's Church into union with itself, and makes it a part of its constitution, it must be understood that nothing contrary to the law of Christ shall be imposed as a law upon the Church. Why does the State adopt the Church as a part of its constitution? Because the State approves and submits itself to Christ's law, and desires to have that law maintained, in the only way in which it can be effectually maintained, by the ministrations of the Church. That is the ground upon which the Church has been received, wherever it has been received, into union with the State. The State wanted the help of the Church to do by religious sanctions, what the State itself could not, and cannot do by temporal sanctions, to make people really and in heart honest, just, kind, good neighbours, and good citizens. The State satisfied itself that the Christian religion only was adequate to that purpose, and this because the Christian religion only was a true religion, and of divine appointment, and then the State became Christian; became Christian as a State; not merely that a great many, or the majority, or even all the citizens, became Christians, but the State itself became so; and thereupon provided for the maintenance and transmission of the religion by establishing the Church as a part of the constitution of the State.

"The endowments of the Church sometimes, to some extent (as in the Roman Empire) preceded, but more generally and largely followed its establishment. The endowment being a secular thing, would, of course, be subject to the ordinary law of the State as to secular property; and was so unless and until the State ordered otherwise. The possession of property by the Church has been sometimes represented as the foundation of the right of the State to adjudicate on questions of Church doctrine. But this is not so. The State adjudicated upon questions of property devoted to religious uses among Dissenters, and even (as in India) among heathen; and in such cases is obliged incidentally to take cognisance of doctrine; but it would not judge between such parties in a naked question of doctrine or discipline, unconnected with property or civil right, as it does in English Church questions. Its right to adjudicate directly on such questions is founded, not on property, but on the fact of establishment.

"It is by reason of the establishment of the Church as a national institution, that it becomes the right and duty of the Sovereign to see that the members of the Church, and more especially the officers and ministers of the Church, according to their several vocations, conduct themselves agreeably to the laws, both of their own Church, and also of the Church universal, of which their own Church is a part.

"There was a time when the sense of the Church universal upon disputed points of doctrine was ascertainable by means of general councils. That state of things has passed away, with small, if any, prospect of its restoration. There was a time when the Bishop of Rome had acquired by usurpation, and by the submission of national Churches to his usurpation, an authority to speak, at least throughout Western Christendom, in the name of the Church universal, and to decide causes spiritual in the last resort on appeal from the ecclesiastical courts of national churches. The

authority was abused, questioned, and finally, by this Church and State of England, denied and abolished. The highest national ecclesiastical courts, those of the Metropolitans, were thus left supreme and final, each in its own province. Yet they were the King's courts, and the law administered in them was the King's law.* That was a clear principle of English law: and when the State asserted the sufficiency of 'that part of the body politick, called the spiritualty, now being usually called the English Church, ... without the intermeddling of any exterior person or persons, to declare and determine all such doubts, and to administer all such offices and duties, as to their persons spiritual doth appertain' (24 H. VIII. c. 12); the State took upon itself the responsibility of seeing that that part of the body politic called the spiritualty did its duty, and particularly that in 'causes of the law divine' it executed justice according to that law. Otherwise we might only have got two Popes in England instead of one Pope at Rome; and the Church of England, both in its clerical and its lay members, might have been liable to be oppressed and misguided under its domestic administration as it had been before under the Papal usurpation. It became necessary, therefore, to provide a Supreme Court of Appeal, which should revise the judgments of the metropolitan courts, and correct them if they were found to have misstated the law of this Church of England, or that of the Church universal, as this Church and realm hath received the same. Out of this necessity arose, first, the Court of Delegates, appointed for each particular occasion by the Crown in Chancery, and afterwards the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, the present court of appeal, settled upon its present footing by 2 and 3 William IV. cap. 92, 3, and 4 William IV. cap. 41, and 3 and 4 Vic., cap. 86, s. 16.

"The *second* branch of the Bishop of London's argument is intended to show that the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, as at present constituted, if not the best possible court through which the Crown could exercise its appellate jurisdiction, is at least so good for that purpose that no change in it is required. This conclusion is, of course, denied by those who desire an amendment in the constitution of the court.

"Those persons are by no means of one accord in their opinions as to how the constitution of the court should be amended. Some would have the power of ultimate judgment vested in a court wholly composed of clerical members, of which several possible varieties have been suggested, as that this jurisdiction should be exercised by the higher House of Convocation, by both houses, by a court of bishops, assisted by theological professors; and many other schemes might be mentioned. Others only desire that the essentially lay court, representing the lay Sovereign, should be more satisfactorily provided than it now is with the means of ascertaining the Church's doctrine; and that no mistake or misapprehension of doctrine into which the court may fall should be fastened upon the Church as a judgment or precedent of perpetually binding force, as if it had the formal authority of the Church, and the Church was responsible for it. But the point on which they all agree is, that the present court is not properly constituted for the decision of causes which turn upon questions of Church doctrine.

"The complainants, it is conceived, would all of them wish to speak with the utmost respect of the lay as well as of the ecclesiastical section of the present court. With regard to the former, in particular, it may be safely stated that it comprises, and according to its constitution must comprise, such a body of judicial talent, as has rarely, if ever, been gathered into one court in England, or in the world. The lay judges possess just those powers of keeping the discussion of a cause within the proper limits of the issue to be tried, and testing the applicability of the pleadings to the law, and of the evidence to the pleadings, in which clerical judges would, from want of legal training, be sure to be deficient. Thus far, it may be presumed, the complainants would be in agreement, both among themselves and with the Bishop of London.

"But with all their aptitude for the judicial consideration of legal questions, there is one branch of law, and that of English law, with which it may, without any disrespect to them, be suggested that the lay judges of the Privy Council have not any more special acquaintance than is possessed by the general body of well-educated and religiously disposed laymen. That law is the law of the Church's doctrine; which

---

* I believe this to have been *always* the case. The statute of *Circumspecte agatis* could not otherwise have defined ecclesiastical jurisdiction.—J. W. A. (Note by Sir J. W. Awdry.)

yet, as the Church is the English Church, is part of the law of England. Theoretically, therefore, the Judicial Committee, being the final court of appeal on questions of that law, should have the highest attainable degree of knowledge of it, as they have the highest power of declaring it.

"When the judges adjudicate upon a question of this law, it is not, as when they are adjudicating upon a point of foreign law coming incidentally before them, a matter upon which they are to receive evidence what the law is, and to draw the best conclusion they can from the evidence; and if in doing so they make a mistake, though they may unintentionally inflict a wrong upon the parties in the cause, they do no injury to the law itself, because they are not the authorised expounders of that law, and their judgment will not be of any authority in other cases in foreign courts, except such as the intrinsic weight of its reasoning may give it. But in cases where the Divine law comes in question, since the State of England has made the Divine law a part of its own law, the decisions of the highest court of ecclesiastical law must of necessity rule the judicial interpretation of the Divine law in subsequent cases; not indeed absolutely, for reasons which will be presently stated, but still presumptively, and until such decisions are upon very solemn deliberation set aside.

"It appears to have been in consequence of a general opinion that the Judicial Committee was in want of some theological advice to assist it in coming to a judgment upon cases of Divine law, that the last statute on the subject, 3 and 4 Vict., c. 86 (Clergy Discipline Act) directed, sec. 16, that in all cases of proceedings under that Act, such archbishops and bishops as should be members of the Privy Council shall be members of the Judicial Committee for the purposes of that Act. Not, let it be observed, in all cases involving doctrine; for (by sec. 19) if the suit, though in form criminal, would have the effect of assenting, ascertaining, or establishing any civil right, the provisions of that Act are not to apply to such suit; and very grave questions of doctrine may be, and have been brought before the court when consisting entirely of lay judges. But supposing that there were no such exception, and that in all cases involving doctrine, the Privy Councillor bishops were to be members of the Judicial Committee, this would not make the composition of the committee satisfactory for its purpose. And this is the main point at issue between the Bishop of London and the complainants. For the bishop considers that the presence and assistance of such bishops as members of the committee is all that can be desired. He says:—'If the judgment be drawn up by a court of mixed constitution, partly lay, and partly clerical, and be not the work of the one presiding judge alone, but . . . be carefully weighed and corrected . . . by the whole court, so that even those judges . . . who are dissentient from the conclusion have full opportunity of moulding the general tenour of the document, does not this arrangement afford the best security for such a union of legal authority with theological learning, as the proper treatment of these causes requires?' (Page xvii.)

"The complainants would answer, No; it does not. It is, indeed, perfectly intelligible that a minority of the judges may prevail upon the majority to modify the *terms* of the judgment to be given; but if both sides are resolute, the *substance* must be carried against the minority. Aye and No cannot be mingled like wine and water, to make a *tertium quid*, stronger or weaker, according as there may be more parts wine or more parts water. We want to have all the factors of the judgment distinctly before us. Did all the lay members vote one way, and all the clerical members the other way, or were there some lay and some clerical on both sides? Who were they? and what were their reasons? It is an absurd fiction to treat the recommendation of the Judicial Committee as private advice to the Sovereign, and require the discordant opinions of the advisers to be covered with a confidential veil of secrecy. The Judicial Committee is a high court of justice; the cause is argued in public; the opinion of the court is delivered in public; and the judges, if they differ in opinion, should state their differences, as is done in all our other high courts. Very inconvenient consequences have flowed from this reticence. The late Bishop of London in the Gorham case, where, indeed, the bishops sat only as assessors, and the two archbishops, who sat as judges in the case of *Essays and Reviews*, felt themselves bound, in duty to the Church, to state extra-judicially their reasons for differing from the judgment delivered as that of the court. Surely it would have been far better if they had been able to deliver their opinions openly in the court itself.

"But though this alteration would be a great improvement in the practice of the court, it would still not be satisfactory. The purpose for which the bishops sit in the court is that by their theological knowledge they may assist the lay members in coming to a right conclusion upon those theological questions on which, though not themselves

professed theologians, the lay members are yet officially obliged to give a theological judgment. That is the intended function of the bishops in the court. Except for that, they had better be away. The lay judges can deal with the legal elements of the case much better without them ; and the judgment, not having, as it now has, a vain show of the concurrence of the Church in it, would not be supposed, as it now is, to compromise the Church by the decision of the court upon doctrine. It *is* a vain show ; because it must be by a mere happy accident if the Privy Councillor bishops really represent the mind of the Church on the point that may be under consideration, and are also able to present it with proper force and clearness to their lay colleagues. It is considered, therefore, and this appears to be a very widely spread opinion among churchmen, that it would be advisable to withdraw the Privy Councillor bishops altogether from taking any part in the judgments of the Judicial Committee, and to substitute some other method by which the committee might be advised as to the doctrine of the Church on such points of the Divine law as might be raised before them.

"It seems most consonant to primitive practice, so far as that practice can be made applicable to the circumstances of our times, and most suitable to the reverence due to the episcopal order, that from that order the advisers of those who are to judge for the Sovereign should be chosen. Their number and the manner of choosing them are matters of detail on which it is unnecessary here to enter. The manner of obtaining their opinion might be either—(1) By constituting them a separate board of reference, to which the Judicial Committee should send questions of doctrine, and after consideration of their joint answer if they agreed, or their separate answers if they disagreed, should recommend to the Sovereign such judgment as to them should seem meet ; or (2) By appointing them to sit as assessors to the committee, and to deliver their joint or separate answers to questions of doctrine proposed to them, as the Judges do to questions of law in the House of Lords. The first method would enable the bishops to sift the argument before them more thoroughly ; but then, as the Bishop of London has justly observed, it would greatly increase the delay and expense, already very serious, of the proceedings. The second method is not liable to that objection, and appears on the whole preferable. But in neither of these ways, nor whether the Judicial Committee act upon the opinion of the episcopal referees or assessors, or whether they determine against it, ought the Church to be considered as committed to the responsibility of the judgment, or bound by it any further than as to the decision of the particular cases. We must not pretend to construct an infallible court out of fallible men. All we can do is to provide, as far as possible, that true judgment may be given, but that no errors of men's judgment shall be so established in our courts of ecclesiastical law as to undermine the truth which we hold of God.

"The Bishop of London is apprehensive that a 'separate ecclesiastical tribunal of reference' might 'give rescripts equivalent to new laws' (pp. xvii., xviii.). It would do no such thing. It would only give an opinion, or set of opinions, which the Judicial Committee would adopt or not, as it saw fit. All that is desired is that the opinions of the referees or assessors should be fully and openly expressed before the court and the Church. Neither the bishops, nor the whole clergy, are the Church ; nor have they any right or power to make Church doctrine ; but their opinions upon it ought to be respectfully received, and considerately weighed ; because they are more strictly bound by their office than the laity are to the diligent study and careful miantenance of the true doctrine, and also because, if we believe at all in the grace of ordination, we must suppose that they will be specially assisted in their endeavours to do what their office requires of them.

"But if there would be danger of the bishops wresting the doctrine, is there no danger of the lay court doing so? If it is to be feared that the bishops might add to the deposit of the faith, is there no fear that the lay court might take away from it?

"Suppose the disposition of the lay court to be to avoid precise statements of doctrine, to sink differences, so as to keep the National Church as comprehensive as possible. The principle may be a good one, but is very liable to be misaplied. The truth must not be denied for the sake of living in apparent harmony with those who hold it not. And yet, if we are always to be acting upon this principle of comprehension, and every decided case is to stand for law, the very foundations of the faith may by degrees be picked away. The Church's law of doctrine is not, like human laws, a thing to be modified from time to time by men's opinions. Canons of discipline and Church order may be varied ; they need not be the same at all times and in all places ; but the truth of doctrine is but one, and cannot be altered. It has been one from the beginning of the Church, and must continue one to the end ; for it

is Christ's law, and unchangeable like its Author. We must guard it both from addition and diminution; and this can only be done by referring every fresh case to the law and to the testimony. Let us always give the court that decided the last similar case credit for having done so according to the best of its judgment. Let us consider the reasons of the decision, and give them such weight as they deserve; but let us not accept them as binding upon the Church's judgment for all future time, as if they were authoritative declarations, either positively or negatively, of the Church's doctrine. The doctrinal law of the Church of England was not made by the Church and State of England. It is the common law of the Church universal, embodied in the Holy Scriptures. The Articles and formularies of the Church of England are but statutory recognitions and declarations of this common law, on the points to which they relate. The Church of England never professed or intended to promulgate a complete and exclusive body of doctrinal law. As far as the Articles and formularies go, they are to us decisive. The clergy assent to them by their subscriptions and declarations; and if a clergyman comes to deny or doubt their truth, the law will not allow him to contradict them, as long as he continues to exercise the office of a minister in the Church. But the body of the law of doctrine is in the Scripture, and there alone."

The Hon. C. L. Wood, President of the English Church Union.

The first thing that I wish to say, in speaking about the ecclesiastical courts, is to acknowledge my sense of the debt which is due to the Commissioners for their labours in the report which has just been published, and in the next to express my sense of the very great value of the historical evidence contained in that report. I venture to say this even with the fear of Mr. Dibdin before my eyes. Mr. Dibdin has told us this afternoon, if I understood him aright, that the historical appendices compiled by Canon Stubbs in no way confirm the contention that what we understand by spiritual cases —*i.e.*, cases of doctrine and ritual—were neither tried in the ecclesiastical courts, or were subjects of an appeal from those courts to Rome. I am obliged to differ from Mr. Dibdin, and I believe it will be found, when those appendices come to be examined, that there is hardly any trace of what we now call spiritual causes being tried by the ecclesiastical courts, but that they were disposed of either by the bishop himself, or in Convocation. Canon Stubbs gives a long list of cases decided by Convocation, but he produces only slight evidence of any cases tried in the ecclesiastical courts. And even if they were tried in the ecclesiastical courts, there is no trace of an appeal from those courts to Rome with regard to doctrinal matters. If there was any appeal at all it was to Convocation. Mr. Dibdin has, I think, been led into this mistake by confusing the diocesan with the provincial synod, and by forgetting that though there may be no evidence of an appeal in cases of heresy from the bishop to his diocesan synod, there is plenty of evidence to show that in whatever way the bishop took cognisance of spiritual questions, in our sense of the word, in the first instance, they were finally disposed of by Convocation—*i.e.*, the provincial synod, and not by the Court of Arches or by appeal to Rome. In the second place let me say, in regard to the recommendations of the report for the revival of the episcopal and provincial courts, that they seem to me an attempt to reconstruct the spiritual jurisdiction of the Church in a way for which we may well be thankful. Those who are sometimes accused of lawlessness wish for nothing so much as a system of spiritual jurisdiction which they can obey, and I trust that this portion of the report, at least, will not be inoperative. But, I should be uncandid if I did not also say that I find it impossible to look with equal satisfaction upon that portion of the report which deals with the final court of appeal. It is proposed that a body of lay judges should be the appellate tribunal, and that a reference from them to the episcopate as to the doctrine and ritual of the Church should be a mere matter of option. Now, it does seem to me, and I say it with a full sense of the responsibility to which the Dean of Windsor has alluded—it does appear to me that it is impossible for churchmen to endorse a proposal which practically leaves the decision of all doctrine and discipline, including, of course, deprivation from the cure of souls, in the hands of the State. We are told by Mr. Dibdin, on behalf of such an appeal to the Crown in spiritual

matters, that we should be careful not to haul down the old flag under which the ship of the Church has continued so long. I endorse his words with my whole heart, only I would remind Mr. Dibdin that the flag under which the ships of England have gone forth to victory is not the Royal Standard, but the Union Jack. It is the Cross of St. George, not the Royal Arms, that flies over the English fleet, and it is just because we desire to give to the Crown all that the Crown may lawfully claim that we refuse to give to the Crown the superiority over the Cross of Christ. I am emboldened to say what I have said by the recommendations of the Commissioners themselves. The report of the Commissioners points out that such an appeal does not exist in the case of the Scotch Establishment. It cannot, therefore, be inconsistent with the principle of establishment that the courts of the Church should be final in regard to spiritual matters. I am not talking about temporal questions, but spiritual matters. Further, if you look to the Report of the Commissioners you will see it goes on to say that it would not have recommended a final appeal to a secular court if it had not made provision for a complete hearing of spiritual things by spiritual persons in the diocesan and provincial courts. It also lays down, "That the function of lay judges is not to determine doctrine and ritual, but merely whether such an offence has been committed against the formularies of the Church *as deserves punishment*." If that be so, why is there an appeal from the provincial court of the archbishop to the final lay court, when a clerk has been acquitted? If the report of the Commission can be so amended as that an appeal to the lay tribunal should only hold in cases where a clerk had been condemned, there would be much more to be said for it as a whole, than, to my very great regret, I am able to say at present. I do very seriously trust that this question of limiting the appeal as I have suggested may be insisted upon in any legislation founded on the report. To conclude, the Dean of Windsor in his remarks seemed almost to imply that we might expect legislation upon the report at once. I would claim the weight of the Dean's own words for delay in this matter. What we have to do, as the Dean himself said, is, in the first place, to master the mass of information contained in the Report. Half our mistakes and troubles with regard to ecclesiastical matters in the past have arisen from legislation passed in a hurry and founded on mistaken views about ecclesiastical affiairs. Let us then when we have this opportunity of peace not be in too great a hurry to take any immediate action, but let the matter be perfectly and carefully considered. Let us not consider too much what we may get from Parliament. I distrust—I wish it were not so—I distrust what we may get from Parliament in this matter, but let us try to arrive at some scheme founded on the report—some scheme which all churchmen can honestly accept—some scheme which will not merely attempt to simply smooth over existing difficulties, but which shall give us a lasting and permanent peace.

The Rev. T. E. Espin, D.D., Rector of Wallasey, and Chancellor of the Dioceses of Chester and Liverpool.

I cannot but think that the result of the discussion of the Commissioners' Report this morning and this afternoon has been, on the whole, very encouraging indeed. Mr. Wood has just sat down saying that we should wait awhile in the hope that something may be devised whereby peace may be secured to the Church, and in that opinion I should most thoroughly concur, if we saw any prospect of peace without some attempt at improving the constitution and working of ecclesiastical courts. We have not got peace as it is, and we shall not have peace until something is done in this matter. I cannot but say that I think the whole result of the discussion this morning and this afternoon gives great hope that something, at any rate, may be done in the direction suggested by the Commissioners. A very large proportion of the recommendations of the Commissioners has not been so much as challenged or questioned, but seems to have been accepted with a tolerable approach to unanimity. And then, again, I would ask you to observe that the difficulties and objections that have been raised, have been made, to a very large extent, against matters of detail, and are not objections made against the whole scheme and theory of what has been propounded by the Commissioners. One point more I must allude to, which I think Mr. Wood touched upon. I was quite surprised it was not brought up before, because a great many of the objections that have been made would have been removed by the very simple suggestion made by Lord Devon in his reservation, and endorsed by Sir Robert Phillimore—I mean that an appeal from the provincial court to the final court

should be allowed to the defendant only. If you think of the working of that it would really almost cancel a very large proportion of the weightiest objections made to the report. And I would beg leave to say there were some Commissioners who I know did not vote for that, because they thought that there was no chance of obtaining it, although they very much desired it. But if it would seem to be the general opinion of the Church that such a limitation of the right of appeal would greatly improve the whole character of the arrangement, why, then let churchmen go in for that, and then I think it possible they might obtain it. There is another point which I should like to mention. There were several of us—of whom I do not mind saying I was one—who were extremely anxious that the presbyters of the diocese should be in some regular form associated with the bishops in the work of judgment in cases of heresy, of doctrine, and of ritual. I, for my part, attach the very greatest importance to the association of the presbyters in that way, and there were several of the Commissioners—I am not sure whether there might not be a majority—who had the same feeling. But when we came to work it out—and you, I think, have no conception of the amount of thought, and care, and pains that were expended on working out the details of this, and a large number of other questions—I say, when we came to work it out, we found that in the present state of things in the Established Church there was no regular, legal form in which you could associate the presbyters of the diocese with the bishop. There is no form which you could suggest in which it could be incorporated amongst the clauses of an Act of Parliament. I will venture to say this: we began our undertaking on the 30th of May, 1880, by receiving the Holy Communion, in the chapel at Lambeth, from the hands of Archbishop Tait. We began our work with a very great variety of opinion among us, and feeling ourselves very much as if in an almost boundless ocean of perplexities, and difficulties, and multitudinous forces of various kinds, from the midst of which for a long time we could hardly see our way at all. We worked away very hard for a time, and difference after difference amongst ourselves seemed, as it were, under discussion and enquiry, to melt away until we reached that series of conclusions which we have presented; which, I think, must have seemed to nearly all of us almost hopeless at first to secure; and arrived at a practical unanimity upon the main lines upon which the report is constructed. Now that, I am quite sure, is a result which was not reached without much thought and care, and research, and prayer on the part of all those engaged in the Commission. And I do think that such a result, reached in such a way—as, indeed, one of the previous speakers has said—ought to commend the report to the favourable judgment of the Church, and to suggest the hope that something may be done upon the lines of the report to pacify and smooth away, and even to cure, the difficulties and the troubles in which the Church has laboured for pretty well half a century.

The Right Hon. A. J. B. Beresford Hope, M.P.

Approaching this most important report, I desire to look at it as a churchman—one desirous of spiritual peace in these troublous times, and as such I am most thankful to the Commissioners for the document so clearly laying down, in the name of so representative and important a body of churchmen of all phases and complexions of opinion, great fundamental truths. There is written on its face a plain recognition of the Christian Church as a spiritual corporation existing of itself in friendship with, but distinct from the State. I see broadly written upon it, too, the continuity of the English Church from the earliest days. And, in the third place, I see the episcopate of the Church, the bishops its rightful judges, the sacred synod of Convocation its rightful assembly. So when I see all that, I am much more inclined to shut my eyes and swallow it as a whole rather than to be in any way critical. But still it is a duty to be critical, if the criticism be that of a friend and a supporter. I say, in the first instance, we are bound to accept the report as a whole, and then, as it were, make ourselves a larger commission, in partnership with the Commission itself, to make it as much more nearly approaching perfection as we can do. What Chancellor Espin has just said is simply invaluable. He lays down, with the authority of one of the most weighty of the Commission, that the court of appeal, which we should perhaps all feel is the weakest point of the whole report, is not unalterable—that it is not the rigid and final conclusion of the Commissioners themselves. It is a thing put out tentatively to

be dealt with and manipulated. Having said that, I think Chancellor Espin has removed the great present difficulty in accepting the report. We do not accept all of it just as it is; we accept it generally as a basis, and not as a coping-stone. There is one thing I think we do not want to alter—I do not for one—that is the bishop's power of making himself the father, and not the taskmaster. Then I go on, and I must ask what can I do with the Commissioners' report as a member of a body upon which its ultimate fate must greatly depend—the legislature of the country? I cannot hold out very great hopes of a very speedy solution. My friend Mr. Wood said great evils came from legislating in a hurry. I almost wish that legislating in a hurry might be the danger ahead of us now. But I cannot help thinking of that gentleman of whom Dr. Johnson said he was afraid he would call out fire at the general deluge. What I fear is not legislation in a hurry, but whether we shall get legislation at all. Those who are at all behind the scenes in Parliament, as an old member must be, know many things and feel many more things which it would be impossible to phrase and explain in a general assembly. Some would seem ludicrous, some would look impossible, and some would be unintelligible. But the upshot of all is, at present the gain of this report is a moral one. It has slain many things which we thought were giants; it has slain the Judicial Committee; it has slain the Public Worship Regulation Act; it has slain the Spiritual Judge who refused to take the spiritual appointment of his own spiritual appointer. And I think for these times that is a great deal to gain. Go on we must; wait our opportunity we must; but consider that, even if Ministers, Cabinets, Home Secretaries, and what not pigeon-hole this report, for the present the moral, the intellectual gain is ours. Things never can be as they were. Things, whenever they become different, must be different on the better, and not upon the worst side. One point there is which I ventured to bring before the Commission in my evidence, which I may here refer to, which I think must be done, and that is, our judges and our lawyers must somehow learn the law which they plead and which they administer. No scheme of ecclesiastical tribunals can be satisfactory until the law of the Church—the old Canon Law, which, of course, involves a knowledge of theology as a science—is revived. And why should it not be revived? What have our Universities been doing lately to regain their intellectual ascendency, but to provide without stint professorships and readerships? Why should the great old Canon Law, for which the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge in the middle ages were pre-eminent, be forgotten? You will say it is not likely to pay well. But, if you open up a career, there are always men ambitious enough to enter it. Old professions are glutted. An old schoolfellow of mine, who was in a marching regiment, got hold of an out-of-the-way language, and he is now famous in two Continents as a Chinese scholar, and our late minister at Pekin. And if you study that example, and many others, you may hope to see your academics in the future holding out invitations to make the canon law a living thing—an active power in the English Church.

The Right Rev. the PRESIDENT.

CHANCELLOR ESPIN has left the room, but he allowed me to make a slight correction of what appears to be an unintentional misunderstanding of his words. I think Mr. Beresford Hope led his hearers to understand that the Chancellor had spoken of the question of the appeal to the Crown as a matter of detail which the Commissioners thought might be arranged. Chancellor Espin certainly did not say, or mean to say that, for he told me so. And if he had said so it would not be quite accurate. There can be no difference as to that being a fundamental part of the scheme. What Chancellor Espin said, or meant to have said, was that the point of allowing an appeal to the defendant only, mentioned in Lord Devon's reservation, was a matter about which the Commissioners differed; and that it was in the Chancellor's judgment a matter of detail which might be amended. Whether it is a matter of detail is a question on which every one may form his own opinion. At all events, it is not one of the most important constituents of the whole scheme; but if I may add one word, let me say it is really hardly fair to quote the opinions of the Commissioners or the conclusions of the report in favour of this, that, or the other point. No report could have been agreed upon if it was to contain nothing to which anybody objected. That is clear; but no report could have been presented which did not take in from either side such things as were inevitable. The report is a practical thing. It is meant

to advise her Majesty and Parliament as to what may be the sort of scheme which may possibly be accepted, which may possibly work, and which is, on the whole, so fair as not to be rejected entirely by either side amongst churchmen. In order to produce a report of that kind it was necessary to consider what could be, with some sort of reason, suggested to Parliament; to have recommended something which a certain number of my friends before me would have liked, which I will not particularise, would have been to make the whole of our seventy-five meetings and all our other trouble absolutely nugatory. To have brought out a report at which Parliament would not have looked, and which no one could have ventured to support, would have been a matter for which I, for one, would not have been content to sacrifice the large amount of time and trouble I did sacrifice; others sacrificed much more time and trouble, and added more continuous work than I did. I should have been very sorry if they had given up their time and trouble to produce something which would have been generally laughed at. Whatever we have produced now, it is not generally laughed at. Of course, some things displease one side and please the other, but the question is whether any working scheme in the Church of England in these days, with all the difficulties and all the conflicting elements, could be devised. We worked under conditions which are, in fact, the conditions of any English enterprise in Church or State, politics, or religion, that is, the condition of considering what other people think and feel. We tried to consider that carefully and faithfully. I hope, and, indeed, I feel sure that, not only this assembly, but churchmen in general, give us a very fair amount of credit for what we have done.

The Right Hon. A. J. B. Beresford Hope, M.P.

The President has kindly allowed me one word. It is only to say that I did not mean to imply anything which does not lie entirely within the lines of his explanation—I meant only to appeal to Chancellor Espin as the witness to the Commission's elasticity on questions of detail. Chancellor Espin referred to an interesting question of detail in a friendly way. He spoke of it as a detail, and I quoted that as a proof that the Commissioners did not insist on their report with a Chinese immovability.

The Right Rev. the President.

The time has now come to close this session, or we could occupy the whole evening in the discussion of the subject. In bringing this Congress to an end I do so with hearty congratulations upon the tone and temper which have prevailed in it, and with great thankfulness to all who have assisted us in managing it, and with the earnest hope that by the blessing of Almighty God some good may have been done during these days of our meeting, some impression left which we should not willingly lose, and some fruit that may ripen into future usefulness for the benefit of Christ's Holy Catholic Church.

TOWN HALL,

FRIDAY AFTERNOON, OCTOBER 5TH.

The Right Hon. Sir J. MOWBRAY, M.P., in the Chair.

THE RELATION OF THE CHURCH AT HOME TO THE CHURCH IN THE COLONIES AND IN MISSIONARY DIOCESES.

PAPER.

The Rev. A. BARRY, D.D., Canon of Westminster, Principal of King's College, London, Bishop-Designate of Sydney.

BEFORE venturing to lay before the Congress the conclusions to which I have been led on some parts of this great subject, I have especially to ask that they may be viewed without any association whatever with the office to which, under the providence of God, I have been recently called. They simply express the convictions of an English churchman of home experience; looking with wonder and thankfulness on the extraordinary development through these Churches of the Anglican communion through the world; but speaking provisionally, and without the authority, either of knowledge, or of position. Nothing is more likely than that they may be largely modified, or completely altered, by even a short experience of the needs and the capacities of colonial Church life. Nothing, therefore, would be further from my wishes than to pledge myself to them, as definite, unalterable principles. In this respect they differ from those which I hoped that you would have heard from my friend Sir A. Gordon; for he could speak from large and intelligent knowledge, and could therefore have claimed for his views, if not agreement, at least much respectful consideration.

But yet two points seem to me to be tolerably clear on this subject; and to these—without attempting to aim at an impossible exhaustiveness of treatment, theoretical or historical—I propose to devote the whole of this short paper.

(I.) The first is this—that these relations of the colonial and missionary Churches are relations which must grow and shape themselves by natural and varied development, which it would be perhaps impossible to fix at any moment by abstract definition, which it would certainly be absurd to hope to determine for all times and all colonial Churches.

They form, in fact, simply one example of the great law of harmonised unity and independence, which is the law of all human life, whether individual or collective, alike in the realm of nature and in the realm of grace.

Clearly there is a unity which should bind in one all these Churches, scattered, like the English race itself, under very various conditions over the length and breadth of the world; and I would describe this unity as unity of doctrine and unity of mission.

I take it for granted, first, that there will be a complete substantial unity of doctrine—accepting not only the Catholic basis, but also the distinctive principles, of the Anglican communion. Whatever independent varieties of development may grow up, I trust that there will be no divergence from these, as expressed in our English Prayer Book; which recognises—what all true views of human nature and God's dealings with it must recognise—at once an ultimate standard of absolute truth in Holy Scripture, and a progressive, authoritative interpretation in the history and in the thought of the Church; which harmonises the principle of authority, and so of continuity of the old, with the principle of freedom, which carries with it origination of the new; and does all this, not by nicely balanced systems of compromise, but by holding firmly to the Lord Jesus Christ as at once the Head of each individual man, and the Head of the whole Catholic Church. To the witness for this solid yet complex truth, untempted by clear logical narrowness on the one side or the other, the Anglican communion seems, by God's providence, to be specially devoted. From this the constitution of every colonial church has again and again disclaimed all right to swerve. Earnestly must we strive and pray that no discordant note be struck in any branch of our communion to mar the full harmony of that witness.

But over and above this unity of doctrine—which is more than sufficient to bind sister Churches together—there is also what I would call a unity of mission, derived to daughter Churches from that which is the mother Church of them all. Each of these Churches has been originally planted, officered, organised, by the Church at home. From her have been derived the succession of its ministry, the principles of its Church law and government, the particular tone and spirit which distinguish the Anglican communion in Christendom. These bonds of unity cannot be forgotten or ignored. The closeness of union may vary at different stages of growth of the daughter Churches, from the almost entire dependence of their infant weakness, to the advanced independence and self-government of their maturer strength. Still at all times it exists. The Anglican communion should form a true Patriarchate. Each diocese must have its right measure of internal government and independence. Each province may, if it will, group its dioceses under a metropolitan jurisdiction. But over all there should still be a bond of union—a silken string (if you will) or, as I should rather say, a fibre of living unity—in that patriarchal primacy, which expresses itself rather in moral authority than in legal power; of which the occasional Lambeth synods or conferences are the visible expression, and of which, as a continuous though unseen influence, I doubt not that the archives of Lambeth abundantly testify.

These two principles of unity are (I believe) abundantly sufficient to secure a thorough solidarity between the Church at home and the daughter Churches abroad. Legally they may be (as high authorities tell us) separate; spiritually I take their whole work to be so really one, that its progress in India or Australia should be as near our hearts as in

London or in Reading itself; and that the more there is, under right conditions, interchange of workers between the Churches abroad and the Church at home, the better it will be for both. I can see, for example, no reason why, when the vigour and elasticity of youth are over, one, who has been engaged in missionary or even colonial work, should not return to the more settled pastorate at home, just as rightly as under similar circumstances he might move from the work of the East-end of London to the greater quietness of a country parish. In both cases he would probably have learnt lessons which would teach much through him to the Church at large.

But under the shadow of these principles of unity it is obvious that there should be in these daughter Churches all possible freedom and variety of development. Legally, as I have said, it seems clear that they are in almost all cases independent communities; and accordingly that they cannot be bound to the detailed laws, methods, organisation, which are here the fruit of the long historical growth of the Church of the English nation. They have the advantages, as well as the drawbacks, of novelty and disconnection from the State—greater completeness of self-government and Church discipline, unfettered powers of legislation in things ecclesiastical and religious. They have to work under simpler conditions of society. They have accordingly opportunities for ecclesiastical and religious experiment, which might be impossible under more complex conditions of Church life. They have, moreover to deal with human nature under all varieties of race, civilisation, religious history. To this variety of need and mission must correspond variety of action and organisation. Year by year, generation by generation, the internal independence of these daughter Churches will grow. If they learn from home, they will also teach; if they reflect the light of great revivals of the Church, they will certainly flash it back again in noble example, in bold enterprise, in display of the inherent power of unaided and unfettered Church life. Who will venture to enclose the variety and fulness of these developments within the limits of a rigid formula?

(II.) But I would contend, secondly, that the relations of the actual growth of these Churches to the Church at home will be largely determined by the relations, political and social, of the colonies and dependencies themselves to the mother country. Let no one fancy that in this is involved anything of that subordination of the spiritual to the temporal, which is loosely called Erastian. The history of the Church shows clearly that this has been in all times the principle of her development, simply because she thus follows the actual growth of humanity, under the providence of God. When the Church grew to world-wide influence under the Empire, the very names of province, diocese, parish, show that her development corresponded to the wonderful network with which Imperial organisation bound civilised humanity together. When in modern history the nation became the unit of human society, then grew up that real, though, of course, limited independence of National Churches, unknown in the earliest ages, on which Anglican theology has rightly laid so much stress. When in our own case, the Great Britain of this little island expanded unto the greater Britain of the empire, with its colonies and dependencies, then—slowly, indeed, far too slowly, but surely—the organisation of

our Church received a similar expansion by the formation of Colonial and Missionary dioceses, which have already begun to federate themselves under metropolitan authority, as our colonies have evidently begun, or are tending to begin, local confederation. Whenever such colonies—suddenly and violently detached, or gradually and freely becoming independent—shall separate themselves from the mother country, then, as we see at this moment in the United States of America, the Churches also, still bound to each other by perfect intercommunion, may become absolutely independent, exchanging the relation of mother and daughter Churches for that of simple sisterhood.

Now what is the general character of these colonial relations to the mother country? There is, of course, a marked distinction between the self-governing colonies, such as those in Canada and Australia, and the Crown colonies and the great Indian Empire, which are still under the direct dominion of the Crown. But the ecclesiastical relations have been, in fact, chiefly determined by the condition of the former class; and the tendency of the action of the Crown has been more and more to place all the colonial Churches on the same footing. Hence it is on the relations of the self-governing colonies to the old country that our attention must be chiefly fixed.

In these there is (as their name implies) an almost complete self-government, limited only by the veto of the Crown, exercised through the Governor; and this, as the power of the Crown acts, of course, through its responsible ministers, implies some ultimate control in the Imperial Parliament. This veto is understood to be exercised almost entirely in cases which touch the central interests of the empire, and even these cases are construed so strictly as to reduce interference from head-quarters to a minimum. The colonies become self-supporting, regulating their own taxation, supporting their own military force, except on occasions of great Imperial crisis. Socially and politically—as in respect of hereditary aristocracy, of commercial principles of Free-trade or Protection, of land tenure, of educational system, of Church establishment—the colonies may differ, generally do differ, from the old country, and even from one another. But are they then, either in law or in feeling, separate from the mother country? The answer, "No," would come back from every side with an indignant emphasis.

They are English still. There is in the Governor the perpetual representation of the Supreme Executive, as vested in the Crown. There lies from the highest colonial courts an appeal to the supreme judicial authority in England. There is in the veto, absolute or suspensive, a virtual recognition, even in legislation, of a supremacy in the mother country. But, above all this, there is, as all who have experience tell us, a spirit of loyalty, if not stronger, at least far more vivid, than at home; and there are at least some colonial leaders, who would propose to themselves, as an ideal, a representation in the Imperial Parliament of all the various colonies which make up the British Empire.

Now I believe that all these things have their true analogy in things ecclesiastical and religious. It is, I know, sometimes thought that the disconnection of the colonial Churches from the State must introduce here a decisive difference, breaking up their solidarity with the Established Church of England. But this I greatly doubt. Under all changes of circumstance, the Anglican Church in the colonies is not really in

essence—whatever it may be in law—one sect out of many. It is the heir and representative of the old historical Christianity of England, which has grown with the growth of its people; it will still, I trust, believe that it has duties, and offers its privileges to all baptized sons of England; it must be affected in things religious by the feeling which Englishmen, as Englishmen, have to the old country, and to the old Church. Its legal relation to the judicial authority of the Crown may be only that not unimportant or ineffective relation which attaches to all religious communities whatever. It needs, as I have said, no permission from home for legislation. It will not be hampered in respect of Church discipline by the legal hindrances which baffle and dishearten us here. But for all this there is in churchmen, and especially in lay churchmen, an utter unwillingness to break off all subordination and loyalty to the old Church of their fathers.

Those gatherings, which we call the Lambeth synods or conferences, show that in things ecclesiastical we have anticipated that ideal of universal representation of the greater Britain, which has as yet been in things political only a dream. Again and again recourse is had to the patriarchal see of Canterbury for authoritative advice and counsel, for appointments to the highest ecclesiastical offices, and the like. Even on the vexed question of judicial authority it is this feeling which is the key to the difficult ecclesiastical problem now presenting itself in South Africa. Whatever dissatisfaction may be felt with the jurisdiction of the Privy Council, it is, I think, remarkable that the Bishop of Capetown and those who feel most strongly with him, are inclined "to acquiesce in the acceptance by the General Synod of some final Board of Reference in England on subjects of faith and doctrine." And I believe that, important as the establishment of a Supreme Court which shall command confidence—confidence, let it never be forgotten, of the laity as well as the clergy—is to the welfare of the Church at home, it may indirectly have a larger importance still in relation to the great Anglican communion as a whole.

Hard it is to maintain rightly the balance of independence and unity—hard, because all things worth having are hard, and there is always a temptation to take refuge in the shallow easiness of some one-sided theory. But it is the only principle which will work, because it alone accords with the truth of human nature and God's government of it in history. At different times its different elements may need to be emphasised. The history of the Roman usurpation may teach us the danger of over-centralisation, and no one wishes to set up a papacy at Canterbury. Time was when it was necessary to plead for independence, against the hard legal conception of subordination, which has utterly broken down. Now I am inclined to think that independence is so assured that it can well take care of itself; and that it is more needful to watch against disintegration, and to preserve some substantial unity.

For it is only thus that the Anglican communion can hope to rise to the extraordinary and glorious call, which comes to it through that extension of English life and influence over the whole world, surely unexampled in history. As England over her daughter nations, so the Church should sit a mother among her daughter Churches. Those

Churches grow from the complete dependence of childhood to the large independence of maturity. But they must be daughter Churches still; and therefore bound together, not only by the supreme unity in the One Father, the One Lord and Head, the One Spirit of Life, but also by the lesser, yet still sacred, relation of filial deference and love to her who is the mother of them all.

ADDRESSES.

The Rev. CANON ANSON, formerly Rector of Woolwich.*

WHEN I first saw in the papers this subject proposed for discussion, it was in the form of "*The Duty of the Church at Home to the Church in Colonial and Missionary Dioceses.*" I trust I shall not be thought to be wandering wide of the intention of the committee in designating the subject as they have now done, if I still venture to confine my remarks to this more restricted subject of *our duty*. For, indeed, the *first* relationship in which we stand to those dioceses, whether colonial or missionary, must be one of simple *duty*, even as the first relationship of a parent to a child is one of duty to sustain and to nurture the new life that has been given. The relationship of the Church at home to those Churches when grown to the full stature of manhood may involve deep and difficult questions, but our duty to them in their infancy is much easier, and certainly not less important. God has given to the people of this country to have the heathen for their inheritance, and the utmost part of the earth for their possession, in a manner far surpassing any other nations of the world; because, bound in very narrow borders at home, our people have had to seek out all the waste places of the earth for their expansion. If I do not speak of our duty to the heathen, especially to those whose lands we have taken on account of this expansion, whether by purchase, by treaty, or by might, it is not because I underrate this duty, but because I wish to speak of the other part of our duty, which it seems to me needs most pressing now, when so much is being said about emigration. This expansion of our people, in countries widely separated from us, has brought with it to our Church a responsibility and a duty even greater—at least, so it seems to me—than the evangelisation of the heathen of whose lands we have taken possession, and that is the duty of taking care that the children who go forth from their homes here shall be provided in their new homes with the opportunities of religious worship according to that holy faith in which they have been brought up, at least until they are so far settled as to be reasonably able to provide it for themselves. As the Bishop of Algoma has well put it—"It is no less important, surely, to prevent our people becoming heathen, than to make heathen Christians." If we may venture to compare the importance of two things, both so necessary, I would unhesitatingly change that "no less important" into "far more important."

It is easy enough for us to speak of the benefits of emigration; it is easy enough for the clergy to advocate it among other people, and to help to send to other countries those who may be half starving here. Nor would I wish to deprecate such efforts. I believe that emigration is the only remedy for many of the evils under

---

* Not being able to arrive in England from Canada in time for the Church Congress, Canon Anson sent his paper, which, however, came too late to be read at the meeting.

which our country is suffering, especially that of an *hereditary pauperism*. But do not let us forget that there is a worse starvation than that of the *body*, and that we incur a *very* solemn responsibility if, for the relief of congestion at home, we send souls forth beyond the reach of those spiritual provisions which are needed for their growth, if not their very maintenance in grace, as living members of Christ's Body. Does, then, our Church make adequate provision for those of her children whom various circumstances thus send forth? Let me speak of one great field of emigration, of which very much has been heard during the last three or four years, and to which thousands are now flocking every year—I mean the north-west of Canada. I have just returned from a hurried visit to the diocese of Rupertsland. That diocese now includes the two great provinces of Manitoba and Assiniboia—an area of about 1,100 miles in length by about 250 miles in average width. Manitoba, west of Winnipeg—that is, for above 250 miles—and a considerable part of the eastern portion of Assiniboia bordering on Manitoba, is fairly thickly settled, while some settlements are found over the whole. Yet for this enormous area there are only at present *thirty* clergymen and a few missionaries, whose work is exclusively among the Indians. Eleven, however, of these thirty are resident in the town of Winnipeg. The bishop told me he had no less than ten stations, for which he had funds and everything ready, but he could not get men to fill them. Hundreds have been going out to that fertile country, very many of them young men of the highest education, sons of clergy, officers of the army, and others, and yet what has our Church done? During the last five years two clergymen have gone out from this country, and of these one soon returned. The accounts I had read in letters of the Bishops of Rupertsland, Algoma, and Saskatchewan to the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel had made me feel that there was a pressing want of clergy in those parts, before which the needs of even a large and important parish in this country seemed to sink into insignificance, more especially when it was remembered how easily and well such wants here could be supplied by others. What I saw and heard, even in the very short and hurried visit I was able to pay to the diocese of Rupertsland convinced me most fully that the statements were certainly not exaggerated—indeed, that much more might with truth have been said. What I saw was indeed enough to make one's heart very sad. In the large province of Assiniboia there is only *one* clergyman settled—at Regina, the capital; there is also one who travels along the line of railway working partly also in Manitoba, and there is one missionary to the Indians. Everywhere, however, Presbyterians and Methodists are alive and active, and they are somehow able to find men to lead their services. In most settlements with only a few houses, they have already built, or are building chapels, to which churchmen have subscribed for want of something better, on condition that when wanted they should be used for Church purposes. Everywhere there are a number of churchpeople eagerly asking when the Church is going to supply their wants, and most enthusiastic and ready to do all they can when any opportunity is offered them. Very often these churchpeople go to whatever services they can find, and thus some get alienated, while others grow disheartened with waiting, and openly renounce their connection with a Church which seems to care so little for its people. I saw a statement of a leading member of the Presbyterian body, who had been making an official tour of inspection through the North-West, that they had 300 stations. I have no reason to disbelieve the statement. I fear the Church could not number fifty in the same area. Is it not a crying shame on our professed Christianity, and on our faithfulness to what we are continually calling our beloved Church, that there should be any difficulty whatever in sending forth, to countries that are being newly settled, a supply of clergy equal, at least in some proportion, to the laymen that leave our shores? It may be said, "It

is difficult to keep up the supply needed for work at home, and that must be our first duty." I venture to deny this latter proposition entirely. If England were a vast continent, with regions yet uninhabited, and the overflow of the population was gradually taking possession of those wild places, should we not think it *just as much* the duty of the Church to extend her ministrations to those borderlands, to the few sheep most in danger of straying, as to continue her ministrations to those in the old folds? And does it make any difference in the principle involved, because the ocean rolls its tide between us and the places where our brothers and sisters have now to seek their new homes? They do not cease to be her children; she does not cease to be their mother; she cannot cast off the duty to care for them which that relationship involves. And after all, is not too much rather made of the distinction between the home and the colonial Church? We are one body—one not because there is the Church of England in South Africa, or Australia, or Canada. I wish, indeed, that such a somewhat meaningless name were never heard. We are the Church of England because we are in England; and it is about as sensible to speak of the Church of England in our colonies as it would have been to speak of the Church of Jerusalem in Antioch, or Corinth, or Rome, as it is to speak of the Church of Rome in England, except as a schism. We are one by a higher title—one as members alike of the one Catholic and Apostolic Church, having the same descent of holy orders, the same pure faith, the same forms of Divine worship. And if we are thus one Church, we should bear one another's burdens, the stronger helping the weaker, wherever it may be found—those that have most ministering to those that lack in all good things. There is surely too much selfishness amongst us—a selfishness manifesting itself not only in individuals, but in parishes, in dioceses, in provinces. We need more corporate action, more sympathetic inquiry as to where the Church, as a whole, is weak, and where it is strong. There is much to be commended in the Roman system of unity. It does not leave any portion of its wide field to the hazard of individual action. It marshals its forces, and sends its officers where they are most needed for the general welfare. We need something of the same practical wisdom in united action. Above all, this united action should make itself manifest in the supply of candidates for holy orders. It is an altogether selfish manner of reckoning the sufficiency of the supply, as is usually done, by considering it merely in relation to the increase of the population that remains at home. We should surely reckon also those who have gone out from amongst us to our colonies. Those colonies, as they receive a large increase to their population from us, may also reasonably expect from us men duly ordained to minister to them. The Church, as a whole, must look for the chief supply of her ministry wherever men are needed from that portion which has the largest population, the best means of education, and the richest endowments, enabling men to obtain that education most generally. I allude to this supply of men rather than of funds, because I am convinced it is what needs most pressing. We begin too often at the wrong end, continually asking for money. What we want is *men*—men of real, self-denying, self-sacrificing lives—men willing to go wherever there is most need. Where such men are forthcoming, I have no fear but that sufficient means for their support will be readily supplied. It is true the life of a clergyman in the early days of even a colonial diocese—much more, of course, of missionary to the heathen—demands of those who undertake it not a little self-denial, the absence of many comforts to which he is accustomed at home, and what is probably the hardest of all, severance from friends and relations. But after all, what are such sacrifices? If a man professes to desire to set forth the self-denying life of Christ as the great example for those to whom he is about to preach, ought such considerations to be any impediment to his going where there is the greatest need of men? Young

men, too, leave home willingly and gladly in the army and navy, for several years, at the call of duty; and numbers are now going forth to seek their fortunes in other countries. Why should not young men be equally ready to go forth for a few years of such pioneer work in the service of the Church as they are in the service of their country, or for their own profit? I say, advisedly, "for a few years," for this is work that seems to me eminently fitted for the energy and the vigour of young men, and offers a manner of life that might be thought to have, even in itself, no little attraction for many of them. And I cannot understand why a man who gives himself to such pioneer work, or even to, more strictly speaking, missionary work, should be considered as necessarily giving himself to it for his whole life, any more than why the man who goes to one of our large poorer parishes should stay there for his life. It is unfortunate, I cannot but think, that this kind of idea should ever have got abroad as it has. Many are prevented from offering themselves, for fear of afterwards seeming to draw back if they return home. Whereas the work is *one*, at home and abroad. And many a young man would find a far more fitting, and even happier field, for the exercise of his energies and activities than in a country parish at home; while, when his years of hard work were done, he would be none the less fitted, surely, for the peaceful and happy life of the country parson at home, because he had gained his experience of souls in rougher fields. Why should not patrons reward such work, yes, even honourably, in their distribution of their patronage? It is work for the Church, not only for a diocese, that should be thus rewarded. We often hear much said in these days about the poor prospects of those who "go into the Church," as the expression is. When our Lord called His Apostles, He told them plainly that they must forsake all if they would follow Him. When He called Saul of Tarsus, He said, "I will show him how great things he must suffer for My Name's sake." And if we would arouse any genuine enthusiasm for the office of the priesthood, if we would see the numbers seeking that holy office recruited in a manner at all commensurate with the needs of our Church, whether in her colonial or missionary dioceses, or at home, we must more boldly and faithfully, and more frequently than I think we are wont to do, bring before our people the dignity and privilege of being called thereto. We must urge it upon men at the Universities; we must tell of it to boys at school; we must preach it in our pulpits, that parents may deem it an ambition to see some of their children in the priesthood, and dedicate them to the Lord, like Samuel, even in their infancy; and we must plainly proclaim that the "prospects" of this profession are nothing in this world, only greater opportunities of serving, and perhaps even suffering, for Him who died for us.

The Right Rev. John Mitchinson, D.C.L., Assistant-Bishop in the Diocese of Peterborough.

In a paper that I read two years ago at the Newcastle Congress, I pointed out that the relations between the colonial and the mother Church have been, and are, in a state of flux. Nor need we marvel at this; crystallisation is a mark of completeness; but, if premature, is a symptom of deadness and immobility. No doubt the desire and intention of the original founders and organisers of the colonial Church was, to extend English dioceses indefinitely over English soil. Nor would this have been an impossible project, if all English colonies had been, and continued to be, integral portions, not of the British Empire, which they are, but of the realm of England, which most of them in no sense are. The French colonial Church is an example of the feasibility of

this view of colonial dioceses. The West Indian dioceses of St. Pierre (Martinique), and Barseterre (Guadaloupe), are dioceses in the province of Bordeaux as completely as those on the soil of France that locally environ that Metropolitical See. But then so are Guadaloupe and Martinique integral units of the French Republic, represented in and legislated for by the French Chambers, and virtually Departments of France. The impossibility of thus translating portions of the State-controlled Church of England, amenable to England-made law, and English law-courts into virtually autonomous communities ought, no doubt, to have presented itself to the minds of the English churchmen who made the attempt. But it was a natural mistake, and one which did not at once reveal itself. So long as no obstacle or friction occurred, all went smoothly enough. It required the Long and Colenso judgments to dispel the illusion, and people ran into the opposite but equally dangerous delusion. The triumphant cry was raised—*The Church in the colonies is free!* And they seem to have assumed that a judicial declaration of the legal untenability of their former situation was an edict of independence, and that this was all that was needed to constitute them and all that they possessed in the way of temporalities, independent of State-interference and State control. The logic of history has shown that no such judicial declaration was sufficient; but that legislative definition and recognition of such independence was needed, and ought to have been sought at the hands of the colonial legislature. For the temporalities of this supposed Church of England, or English diocese in the colonies, which had been found to be a phantasm in law, were a solid fact, and appertained to somebody; and, the real possessor having been found to be a myth, they passed, I presume, into the trusteeship of the State, *i.e.*, the Colonial Government, to be by it made over and secured by legislative enactment on the *cy près* principle, to that body of Christians which claimed and was *bona fide* meant to be the Church of England in the colony. Probably this step was taken in most cases, where the independence (from the State point of view) of a voluntarily created and supported colonial diocese had to be recognised and defined, or where the disestablishment of a State-controlled and State-paid Church was carried out as a piece of colonial policy. This course certainly was adopted when the English dioceses in the West Indies were suffered to collapse, and the Church was disestablished and disendowed in the different islands. Disestablishment came first in Jamaica; and the Jamaica Act was taken as the model for similar Acts in all the islands of the Lesser Antilles, where disestablishment was forced on the more or less reluctant little colonies, *i.e.*, on all, excepting Barbadoes, which firmly resisted the attempt. There were, no doubt, one or two objectionable features in the Jamaica Act, but these in practice were easily evaded or nullified. This step apparently was not taken in the South African Dioceses; and hence have arisen the Grahamstown troubles, and the apparently impending troubles at the Cape. And till the side of the question I have been drawing your attention to has been fairly faced, and legislative recognition has been secured by the South African Church, and its position and rights defined by an Act of the several colonial legislatures concerned, the position of the South African Church, as regards its temporalities, appears to me to be perilously insecure. It is not unreasonable to expect that the State may prescribe its own terms of recognition, and endeavour to secure the *cy près* principle as far as State enactment can do it, by insisting on an alteration of the style and designation of the religious body which claims to be the Church of England in South Africa, and to hold the ecclesiastical property of that Church in those colonies. Not improbably, the name of "The Church of the Province of South Africa"— never a very happy designation, and one quite capable of conveying an erroneous idea as to its *status* and pretensions—may have to be abandoned; and it

may find itself designated, as is the case in so many other Disestablishment Acts, as "The Anglican Church in the Colony of Capetown, Grahamstown," etc. And this brings me from the more legal aspect of the relation between the home and colonial Church, on which I am less competent to speak, to the consideration of deeper and wider relations, which by the silent but irresistible logic of facts have developed themselves and forced themselves into notice.

1. The colonial Church has materially modified the *raison d' être* of the Church of England, and widened its limits. Previously to throwing out all these goodly offshoots, the Church of England was a mere National Church, justifying her existence and independence on the branch theory, as implied in the last clause of Article XXXIV. compared with the concluding portion of Article XIX. Since the development of her vast colonial ramifications, she has, through no action or ambition of her own, become Imperial instead of National; she has developed into a recognised Communion or Family within the great Church Catholic, *i.e.* (to quote her own definition of the term), "the whole congregation of Christian people dispersed throughout the whole world." Without Rome's pretensions—certainly without Rome's intrigues—from being the Church of a great nation, she has grown into a far-reaching "obedience." The outward and visible manifestation of this changed ecclesiastical *status* may be recognised in the Lambeth Conference, whose dicta, euphemistically called "recommendations," carried throughout Anglican Christendom a moral weight in inverse ratio to their legally coercive power.

2. The colonial Church has broken down much of the Erastianism which was inseparable from the Church of England, owing to the circumstances of her Reformation, as well as to other causes, both of earlier and later growth. I use the term *Erastian* in no offensive sense, but merely as a convenient expression for the inextricable intertwining of Church with Realm, which is inseparable from the Church of England as contrasted with the Anglican Church. It has brought into clear light the fact that this Erastianism is merely an accident, not the essence of our branch of the Church. In particular, it has taught churchmen that the Royal Supremacy (except in the sense in which every loyal subject, be he secular or spiritual, recognises the sovereignty of the Throne) is not *of the essence* of any Church; and that under Christ, the great Head of the Church, the Church, *i.e.*, the whole body of the faithful, is supreme, and constitutes a Christian republic or commonwealth. It is curious to note how the two ways in which especially the Royal Supremacy is exercised in the Church of England have vanished in the colonial Church; viz., the nomination of bishops by the Crown, and the final decision by the same authority of causes ecclesiastical. The Crown has abandoned the right of nominating to colonial sees in all cases, I believe, except the Indian bishoprics and Gibraltar; and the Judicial Committee only hears appeals on matters ecclesiastical from the colonial Church through the civil courts of the several colonies, and then not as ecclesiastical causes, but simply as matters affecting the rights of persons or property.

3. The colonial Church has taught the mother Church some valuable lessons. It has taught her the value and feasibility of synodical action. It has taught her that the indefeasible rights of the laity in the government, legislation, and administration of the Church, may with perfect safety be ungrudgingly conceded, and that their co-operation in all such matters is a tower of strength to the Church; and it has taught her the great lesson, which may some day be of such vital importance to herself, viz., the practicability of self-maintenance, as well as of self-government. In this respect it has taught her by mistakes, which have undoubtedly been made in some places, what faulty principles and methods to avoid, and by excellently devised schemes of Church finance in other places, what to adopt or copy.

And what has the Church of England done in the way of reciprocity for the colonial Church? How has she requited it for this elevation that I have described into a higher sphere and a nobler *status?*

1. She has given it, and still continues to give it, leaders; some of her own most gifted and best trained sons—the names of Selwyn, Patteson, Gray, Field, Coleridge, Short, Moorhouse, Barry, at once occur, though it seems almost invidious to single out names from so rich a catalogue of men that have been sent out to officer the infant colonial Churches. Not that we undervalue home-spun material, the native produce of the colonial Church. Witness the great American Church of to-day, with its strong, and in many cases brilliant, episcopate, as well as many a bright light of native growth in our own colonial dioceses.

2. She has known how to recognise her daughters' growth to womanhood, and to receive them on equal terms into unreserved conference with herself.

3. She has imparted to them the germs of organisation, and so enabled them to develop into healthy existence on sound and catholic lines.

What I conceive the reciprocal relations of the colonial and mother Church might be, and ought to be, I endeavoured to express in the discussion two days ago on Missions.

DISCUSSION.

The Right Hon. the Earl Nelson.

The unity of the Church and the colonial and missionary Churches is complete, though we are not bound together by State bonds. There is a unity of doctrine, of mission and fellowship as parts of the great Catholic Church of Christ, and I cannot sympathise with those who long for a unity more complete than this. It is all very well where Church and State have been united for some time to do our best to maintain that unity, but if it is God's will that it should come to an end, there is nothing essential about it; and where in the case of most of the colonial Churches, the State has deliberately shaken them off, I consider that for a Church again to try to put herself, against the will of the State, under State shackles, is a suicidal act, which would quench the spirit of Christianity within her. And yet, as is well known, in the case of Williams *v.* Bishop of Grahamstown this has been attempted and longed for by some; and though by the resolutions of the synod of the province the threatened schism has been avoided, certain people in the colony claiming to represent the Church of England as by law established, have warned the trustees of the Colonial Bishoprics' Fund from paying any of the interest of the monies in their hands to the present bishops in South Africa in consequence of the Privy Council's decision on that case. That case was not an ecclesiastical cause, but distinctly a secular procedure in reference to endowments, and not in any way touching doctrine. But, though I am no lawyer, I can gather this much from the decision of the court. Dean Pelham, though nominally gaining the case, was virtually worsted in most of his contentions. It was decided he had no right to call himself the Dean. It was shown that the separate appointment of bishops did not disconnect the Church with the mother Church of England, that separate synodical action did not do so, and the only thing which was supposed to make the difference was the fact that by a resolution of the Church in South Africa, they were not to be bound by the decision of our ecclesiastical courts. I have no hesitation in saying that if there had been the power of appeal that judgment could be overthrown. For among other things there is this patent fact staring us in the face, which the judges seem to have forgotten altogether, that in the case of the united Church of England and Scotland, united together as far as Acts of Parliament could unite them in indissoluble bonds, there was this marked distinction, which was never held to interfere with their duty—that both Churches had different and independent ecclesiastical courts, and the decision of the one had nothing whatever to do with the decisions of the other. I can only say if

these good people in South Africa attempt to maintain their claim, we of the Colonial Bishoprics' Fund must resist it to the death, and force on a new trial, which, for the reason given above, and for others which I have no time to touch upon, must decidedly reverse the present decision. I would willingly have said more but my time is up. Allow me to throw out one suggestion. We know our good friend Dr. Barry is going out as Metropolitan of Sydney. He will be met there by a Roman Catholic Archbishop of Australia. I cannot understand why the metropolitans of our colonial Churches, where the duties of metropolitans are associated with a special See, should not, as at home, bear the title of Archbishop, and I only hope the Conventions of the colonial Churches will consider this subject, and claim such title for their metropolitans.

The Right Rev. BISHOP ABRAHAM, Canon and Precentor of Lichfield, late Bishop of Wellington.

I WAS told just before I started for the Congress, that my dear friend Canon Anson could not attend on this occasion, and I was ordered by superior authoritity to make a speech, as it were, in his place. Canon Anson is a man whose name ought to be, and I think will be, held highly in the Church for his work's sake. I have known him for some fourteen years, and he is one of the class of men from whom we may expect good things for the Church, not only at home but abroad. When I first knew him, being a brother of the Lord-Lieutenant of the county, he held a living where there was a most beautiful church, and most beautiful services. I made friends with him, and we parted; but about six months after that I had to go to one of the poorest and roughest churches in the country, and who should I find but Canon Anson as vicar. I said, "It astonishes me to find you here. What can be the meaning of this?" He said, "That place was too clean for me;" and he went for the hardest work. That is just the character of the man, and to my mind it is a fine thing to see that one of our aristocracy, and a perfect gentleman, goes to the place where the roughest and hardest work is to be found. With regard to the subject on the paper, I am afraid that I do not hold so favourable an opinion of the relation of the established Church at home to the Church in the colonies, as previous speakers seem to hold. I do not believe we are as free in the colonies as has been said. It is said that the Crown has parted altogether with its authority over the Church and the colonies, and that it does not appoint the bishops. Well, the Crown claims to appoint the bishops, although it holds the power to do so in reserve, as it were. Both parties in the State, within the last ten years, have declared their intention to leave the matter in abeyance, but at any moment the Government may claim to appoint a bishop; and the Church in the colonies is therefore by no means free from the possibility of a revival of the claim. One colonial synod has obtained from the Colonial Government, what is wrongly called "authority," to appoint a bishop. All that it ought to have done, and perhaps has done, is to get an Act, to say that the bishop nominated by the synod, is the legal successor to the former bishop who held Church property by letters patent from the Crown. When it is said that the colonial Church is independent of the Church establishment, the fact is that in most of the contracts and compacts made by churchmen themselves, they have inserted an acknowledgment of their obligation to the United Church of England and Ireland; and that carries with it to a certain extent an obligation to the Privy Council. I should not be at all surprised if the recommendations of the Commissioners on ecclesiastical courts clear the way to a great extent, so that there may in the future be none of the difficulty which now exists. It is a remarkable thing that you, Mr. Chairman, should be presiding over us to-day, because it was at Mortimer, where you reside, that the whole controversy began. Twenty-six years ago the Crown claimed the living of Mortimer, because the vicar had been appointed Bishop in New Zealand. But passing to more spiritual relations between the Church at home and the colonial dioceses. I have often thought, from what I have seen both in this country and in the colonies, that the relations between the two Churches are mutually beneficial. The ecclesiastical government of the colonies by the Church is far superior to that which exists at home; but the spiritual and religious tone is higher at home than in the colonies. With regard to missionary work, the great benefit which the missionary

districts receive from England is that they are obtaining the services of men of great talent and energy. Men are going, for instance, from Cambridge to Delhi, and from Oxford to Calcutta. One can imagine what an astonishing amount of influence such men have over the natives. Whenever you send these talented men amongst the natives, the relation is most beneficial to them; and, on the other hand, you benefit by it, for while you are losing some of the adherence and attachment of scientific and educated men in this country, the Church can still touch the hearts of natives in all parts of the world. Sir Bartle Frere has told us that he found the Gospel was suited to every class and community in India; and in these missions not only is the Gospel found to be suited to the requirements of humanity, but the Church of England seems at once to supply exactly the kind of authority and liberty which the natives, and which men of very different character and education, require.

The Rev. Dr. Leighton Colman, of Ohio, U.S.A.

I throw myself upon your fraternal indulgence for presuming a second time to address this assembly of English churchmen. When I spoke in the Congress Hall on Tuesday, it was at the suggestion of others, who thought that the interest of the discussion on marriage laws (if you will kindly permit a moment's reference to it) might be enlarged if one from America should tell of dangers and responsibilities, and convictions akin to your own, and while I was obliged to acknowledge much ground for shame in some respects, yet, it is a great satsfaction too, to feel that, owing largely under God, to the utterances of our bishops, and the action of our ecclesiastical councils, many of our social evils are now, more than ever, in a fairer way of being corrected. This afternoon, I have ventured to come before you on my own motion, and I hope that when I give my reason for doing so, you will not think it an *insufficient* one, nor hear me less patiently because of my speech being prompted by no one else. I felt anxious by a reference to the blessings which God has shown the Church in that part of America which was formerly a colony of England, to deduce an argument—having, I think, its own special significance—an argument in favour of extending your most cordial co-operation to the colonies which still remain to you, and to those which may in the future be added to their already considerable list. It is, as you were reminded by the bishop of the diocese, on Tuesday, when prayer was offered by you for our general Convocation, just 100 years since our Church in the United States entered on its independent career, and a convenient time is thus offered for a review of her past history. While we cannot present statistics as satisfactory as we would wish, we yet do feel that we have very much for which to be devoutly thankful to Almighty God. I could, if the time and subject allowed, give you reasons for our not being stronger than we are, but I am sure you all will rejoice with me in knowing that the Church is at present growing, and *has been* for a number of years past, growing very rapidly, more rapidly in proportion than even the quickly-multiplying population of the country; more rapidly than any other Protestant religious body there, and except for emigration, much more so than the Roman Catholic Church. True, we are as yet numerically smaller than some others, but there is not one of them, I am persuaded, that has the same amount of influence upon the nation at large, or that is looked up to so confidentially as the eventual rallying point of *all* Christian people. In regard to my subject of marriage laws for example, it is the Church which has taken the leading and most influential action for their reform and stability. It is in no spirit of vain-glory or boasting that I make this statement, but for the purpose of expressing our convictions that had it not been for the help which, as colonies, we received from England, we should not have been, humanly speaking, able to attain our present position. Indeed, unless the missionary spirit had prevailed in the *English nation* during the 17th and 18th centuries, giving a *religious* character and direction to the first explorers and many of the colonists from this country, the New World would have remained for a long time without the blessings of Christianity. Later on, the help of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel (a society whose name, *initials even*, no American churchman can ever speak but with the utmost reverence and gratitude), was the only human instrumentality by which many of our older parishes were kept supplied with a religious ministration, and such ministrations were extended to others. I must not allow myself to go into particulars, but confine myself, however reluctantly, to general statements, which, however can be

amply verified by existing documents—attested, indeed, by the hundreds of new flourishing Churches throughout the older portions of our country. What I am particularly desirous of impressing, if I can, upon the minds of English churchmen, is this: that upon the measure of their present help to the infant Churches of their colonies will very largely depend the future growth and strength of these Churches, as also the welfare of the whole community, a trite and undeniable conclusion, you may say; but speaking as I do, from what I might call a personal experience of the happy results of such sympathy and aid in my own country, it appeared to me that you might be willing to hear it again. No one in the beginning would have presumed to predict such a future for the United States as she has, by the blessing of God, and, as I believe, by the promulgation of Christianity, already reached. Who can now safely estimate the future greatness of your *many* prosperous colonies? Had *we* in the United States received more direct and liberal aid of various kinds in the beginning, we should, we believe, have more to show for it to-day. Do not, by indifference, or stinted gifts of men, and money, and prayers, retard the religious and Christian development of these distant parts of your empire. I again ask your pardon for speaking, and must thank you for acceding me a privilege that I shall always remember and cherish. When one thinks of the precious, magnificent, and yet awful trust that is committed in these days to what I might style the *Anglo-American Church*, one hardly knows how to be brief in speaking upon such a theme as this; but, shall I forbear? It is, indeed, a precious deposit of truth that you and we have received, and it must be handed down unimpaired to our children, and our children's children. Let us together resolve, under the fresh inspiration which the Congress has certainly supplied; let us resolve that by God's grace, *it shall be so* handed down.

Sir A. Arbuthnot.

I have been unexpectedly asked to say a few words in reference to that great country where I spent the greater part of my life. I refer to India. There is one point which is at the present moment very pressing in connection with the Church in India, and which I wish to submit for your consideration, although it may perhaps be thought that it is scarcely covered by the description of the subject of the meeting. I imagine, however, that it was the intention of those who framed the programme, that we should discuss the relations of the Church of England outside the united kingdom to the Church at home. The Church in our great dependency includes, not only our various colonial churches or missionary dioceses and agencies, but also the Indian Church establishment, which has hitherto been maintained by the State. You have been told that the Church establishments in our great colonies have been in some important aspects practically supported by the State. But it is not the case with reference to India. There we have had, during the greatest part of the present century, a Church establishment maintained solely by the State, and for the furtherance of those objects for which the State exists. It will be in the recollection of many that in the earlier years of our tenure of India very little was done to provide even our own countrymen with the ministrations of our religion. It was not till 1813, when, owing mainly to the influence and earnest efforts of one who bears, and will long bear, in English history an honoured name, Bishop Wilberforce, that the Church establishments to which I am about to refer were in the first place organised. At this moment an effort is on foot largely to reduce those establishments. A short time ago a member of one of the great political parties, a man of some influence, not a member of the Church of England, visited India, and he seems to have applied his efforts during his stay largely to produce an agitation on the part of the natives of India against the policy under which the State establishment has been provided out of the revenues of that country. I understand that for some months past the Government in this country have been in correspondence with the Government in India for the purpose of procuring a reduction of the establishments. I would ask you to consider what such a measure means. The position of India is very different from the position held by our colonies. The Englishmen in India, in comparison with the native population, are but a handful of men. It is very difficult for them to provide, as is done in our great colonies, for the cost of maintaining the establishments which are needed by them. The avowed

object of these establishments has been to provide for the servants of the State. No doubt more has been done by them. We must remember that in that country, in addition to men of our own race and the natives of the country, there is a large body of persons of mixed race, for whose being we Englishmen are responsible, and for whom it is our duty to provide. It behoves, therefore, all parties interested in the well-being of our Church in India to resist this proposal for the reduction of the establishments. It especially behoves the bishops of our Church to do what they can to prevent such a disastrous measure being brought to completion.

The Rev. E. C. Paget, Principal of the Missionary College, Dorchester, Oxon.

The Church of Jesus Christ is One, Holy, Catholic, and Apostolic. If we could have remembered that the first great note, that of Unity, which Canon Barry has brought before us, is in its essence as living and real between the Church in the distant lands and the Church at home as the life of Christ Himself, the perplexities of some churchmen in South Africa had been swept away like cobwebs. There would also, I think, have been a greater freedom and generosity in the supply of clergy from the Church of England to the Church abroad. I do not speak now of particular enterprises like the Oxford mission to Calcutta, or the Cambridge mission to Delhi, but of the regular organisation by which the Church at home yearly trains up some 150 men as clergymen, exclusively and entirely for the Church abroad. I think that, considering the nature of the work, less is known about it, in proportion to its importance, than about any other of the many great works of the Church, and perhaps it receives less sympathy and support. I would ask you to think what missionary colleges do for the Church at home and abroad? They are, in the first place, centres of home interest in missionary work; they are, secondly, training schools in which men are prepared for ordination without costing colonial or foreign dioceses one single penny; they are, thirdly, places where men's capabilities and vocations are thoroughly tested; and, fourthly, they are what depôts are to regiments on foreign service, places where colonial bishops can look with certainty for the clergy that they need. Think also of those who are working abroad from the missionary colleges. I know that much is said about the great need of having University men abroad. Speaking as a University man myself, I would not for a moment think lightly of the advantages of a university training, but it is at the same time no use denying that there are disadvantages attached to the Universities of the present time. No one who was present at the discussion yesterday morning could help realising that there might be some ways in which the Universities are not the best training places for a clergy which is to do single-hearted and devoted work either at home or abroad. The old superstition that a University education is absolutely necessary for a clergyman, or is even the very best thing in all cases, is, I hope, by this time exploded. We have only to think of two names—Bishop Strachan, of Rangoon, and Canon Lightfoot, of Cape Town, to be sure that St. Augustine's, Canterbury, is able to send out as good men as any of our Universities. Let me speak also of one of our Dorchester men who is now in a position of great danger. You know the state of affairs in Zululand, and how a little stone cathedral has been built at Isandlana. Not long ago, while the fighting was going on, Edwin Farmer, who left Dorchester three years ago, was in sole charge of that cathedral, the bishop and his wife being away. I had a letter from him, in which he said he could not tell whether the bishop had escaped or not, or whether he himself would be attacked by the natives. He added—"I felt, while about to celebrate the Holy Communion to-day, that it was peace to realise that a little band of Zulu Christians were gathered together with their priest praying for their native country. If that little light is left it is that which shall lighten the Gentiles and bring peace at last to the land." I dare to say that no missionary, however clever or however well trained, could have stood more bravely alone at his post, in a more calm and devoted spirit, than this young hero. I would ask your practical sympathy, then, for the work of training up men for foreign service. It is not an uncommon thing that a young man comes to us full of zeal to be prepared to go abroad and he passes his term with us, and is strengthened in his purpose. But the vacation comes; he goes to stay with some kind friend, and the friend, instead of encouraging his devotion, says to him,

"You are so useful; what a pity it is you should go abroad;" or, "Your health is not good enough to go abroad." Is that the way, I ask, to strengthen the hands of those who are endeavouring to do this part of the Church's work? I would venture secondly, to point out that the bishops abroad might do much to help us by being more business-like, by answering our letters punctually, and by letting us know precisely what they want and what they can offer. I would also, in the third place, throw out a suggestion which is not my own, but which I owe to the Bishop of New Westminster. Could not our men sometimes be ordained in England to serve for a short time in an English curacy in some well-organised parish, and so to learn the routine of parochial work? They would thus become twice as valuable to the Church abroad. We must, however, leave it to the bishops to establish such a system and to the parish priests to co-operate. If anyone wishes to know how he can help us in our work I shall be glad to communicate with him if he will write to me.

The Hon. and Rev. HENRY DOUGLAS, St. Paul's, Worcester.

THERE are some in England who seem almost to think that there is not a desire on the part of the colonial Church for that union with the Church at home, which we say ought to be maintained; but such an idea is entirely erroneous. That question never assumed any form at all until the relations between the two came to be looked into as regards the position in which they respectively stand to the State. I may say that I have been for a long time connected with the colonial Church, and especially with the Church in South Africa, where this question first assumed a definite form. The decision of Lord Westbury in the Long case greatly intensified the importance of the subject, and then the question arose a second time with regard to the Natal Bishopric, when the action of the Colonial Bishoprics Fund was called in question. The Colenso heresy, and the unnecessary action of the Church of South Africa in connection with that heresy, greatly increased the feeling of interest respecting the relation of the Church in the colonies with the Church at home. The issue was that there was declared to be no legal union between the Church at home and in the colonies; but at the same time there was acknowledged to be the relation which subsists between mother and daughter Churches in the closest possible spiritual union and communion. This relation, I wish clearly to say, has all along been most really, fully, and distinctly maintained and desired by all the Churches of the colonies, and especially by the Church of the Province of South Africa. I believe that is the best title that can be applied to that Church, and we have many precedents for adopting such a title, assigning to it its distinct position. Look at the Church here in England and the Church across the border. Are we not in the closest union with the Church in Scotland? I stand here as a representative of that union, holding as I do preferment in the Church in Scotland, and preferment also in the Church of England. It is, as I have said, the desire of the Church in the colonies to maintain the closest union with the Church at home. We saw lately that by the unanimous voice of the diocese of Grahamstown the Bishop of Bloemfontein was elected to the head of that diocese. On Monday last it was the duty of the Synod of Bloemfontein to elect a bishop in place of him who had just been transferred to the See of Grahamstown, and we learn by telegraph that the appointment has been left in the hands of the Archbishop of Canterbury and the Bishops of Edinburgh and Truro, and this is the sort of action that will best maintain the true and most to be desired union and communion of the Catholic Churches of England here at home, and the daughter Churches abroad. I will conclude by reading a few words spoken by Bishop Webb on first entering on his new charge as Bishop of Grahamstown. He says, "I should not have ventured to undertake so great a responsibility as the charge of this See, in succession to your late brave and noble-hearted bishop, if I had not been persuaded that God had called me hither by manifest tokens of His providence; and I thank Him most humbly and heartily that He has vouchsafed to order that this call from Him should be further sealed, as it has been, by the goodwill of the bishops of the Church of England and our own province, the benediction of the Archbishop of Canterbury, and, above all, by the warm assurances of sympathy and support from our brethren of the Anglican Church in this diocese." Speaking of the difficulties besetting the Church in that diocese, he says, "I desire earnestly that none of us may exaggerate,

but rather labour to heal them. While we may reasonably, and without shame, acknowledge that we are not bound to entertain one and the same opinion on all questions, we can face our difficulties in the same spirit of patience, mutual trust, and forbearance. We are all agreed, I am persuaded, upon the fundamental principle of loyal whole hearted allegiance to our mother Church of England."

The Rev. THOMAS BARKER, Vicar of Revesby, Boston.

I FEEL almost ashamed to divert your attention just for a moment from the large views which have been expressed in the speeches hitherto made, to the question of returned missionaries. In certain ecclesiastical papers, which are not very Christian in their temper, you may have met with the phrase "Returned Empties." In the first chapter of Ruth we find the words, "He went out full and He returned empty," and it sometimes happens that one who has been doing the work of our Church in the colonies returns home empty of the domestic happiness, and a considerable portion of the health with which he went out. It is hard that a single word should be uttered to injure the feelings of such a man, and the temper which would inspire such a word is little short of brutality. The clergyman who goes out as a missionary from England has a right to be considered as connected with the Church of England, and when he returns home he has a title to be made useful, if possible. Not that there should be any encouragement to a system of going out only to return home again very soon, because it would take half the time to learn the language, and the funds of the society would be exhausted in paying passage money. We ought, also, to bear in mind the advisableness of founding theological colleges in the colonies themselves, for it must be remembered that, in any missionary diocese, we are only working at the foundations of a Church until that Church is able to stand by itself.

The Rev. W. S. DARLING, Holy Trinity, Toronto.

I HAVE regretted exceedingly to hear so many side issues brought up, and to have so many small technical matters occupying the time which might have been better employed. I think we ought to look at the fact, that we are not the Church of a nation, but of an empire, nay of a race, and that the bond which unites us is the great spiritual bond of the Catholic Church of Christ. It is marvellous to me that educated Englishmen cannot raise their thoughts to the destiny which awaits, not only the English nation, but the English race. I have for forty years worked in the great Dominion of Canada, and I know every inch of the land, from end to end. There is a life, there is a vigour and an earnestness in the people who grasp the Catholic faith there, that laughs to scorn the miserableness of establishments, and the littleness of mere earthly government. It is on the grand, spiritual kingdom, which our blessed Lord has founded, that the great strength and glory of the Church depends. It is that makes us as one; it is that makes us into a body which all the powers of the earth cannot put asunder; and, if we can only grasp it, no human tongue can tell us the magnificent destiny which awaits us. It is only in wandering over the vast dependencies of the British empire that we realise this. The destinies of our race are but beginning. Where the flag of England floats, there the Church of our fathers, the Church of the living God, is bound to conquer. The more she is thrown on her own resources—and yet not her own, but those of the Father—the more she rises to the glory of the work that awaits her. Talk about Privy Councils, or about Lord Penzance! It is the Divine truth of the Spirit of God that dwells in the Church that is raising her up. In the life of one man, in one of the colonies of the British empire, we have raised from two to seventeen dioceses, allowing ample room for extension and development; and, day by day, the Church is going forward, so that it will not be long before, in that dependency, we shall have forty millions of people, and fifty, or perhaps seventy, dioceses.

The Rev. E. A. Salmon, Vicar of Martock, Somerset, and Prebendary of Wells.

I wish to call attention to a suggestion which was brought before my notice by the speech of Canon Barry, and then by the speech of the Principal of Dorchester College. Canon Barry brought out very clearly the relation between the Church at home and the Church in the colonies. Would not that relation be brought out still more clearly, if it were possible, as was suggested the other night in the meeting on Foreign Missions, to invite young men to serve for a limited time, say five or seven years, in the colonies, and then return home. It might be provided that, with regard to anything in the nature of preferment—which ought to be the last thought in their minds, but might be a consideration—the time they had spent in the colonies should be considered in just the same light as if they had been working in parishes in England. I know there are objections raised to this scheme. In the first place, it is said that it takes a man a great many years to learn the language and habits of a people, and that when a man devotes himself to this work he should devote himself to it for life ; and that nothing but the sternest necessity should ever bring him home again. But this applies only to work among the heathen ; in the case of the colonies it is a far different question. If young men would volunteer for service in the colonies for a limited period, not only would the Church in the colonies be grateful for their services, but they would carry with them some of the stability of the old Church, and engraft it on the flexibility of the new, while at the same time they would gain an experience which would be of great benefit to the home Church, especially in the days which, though God forbid, seem to be looming in the distance, days of disestablishment ! Would it not be well if our great missionary societies were to invite young men to volunteer for this service ? As to the extra cost of the voyages, this is but a comparatively trifling consideration, and I think that many would want very little in the way of stipend to induce them to go to the colonies for a limited time, who would, perhaps, shrink from service in the colonies for life. While there is such a cry for help from North-west America and Australia, and while it is a fact that we want about seven times as many men as we have, why should we not try and induce some of our young men to volunteer for this service ?

The Rev. George E. Jelf, Canon of Rochester.

We have heard a great deal this afternoon with regard to the legal and ecclesiastical aspects of this most important question, but we must bear in mind that when we speak of the Church we mean churchmen and churchwomen, and, therefore, what we have really to consider is the relationship we have with the churchmen and churchwomen in the colonies and foreign parts. I think it would not be well to separate without thinking of the spiritual aspects of the question also. I would say that we should try and express that spiritual relationship in three ways :—1st, by prayer ; 2nd, by study ; and 3rd, by thanksgiving. Is it a fact that all of us in this room do bear in mind day by day, on our knees, the requirements of the Church abroad ? I would suggest that always at our mid-day prayers, which I hope we faithfully offer to God, we should show that we are practically bound up in not only a unity of doctrine, but a unity of life, with the noble workers for the Church in America, Australia, and all the islands of the great and wide sea. I would suggest that we should also study the work going on in foreign parts, and show in this way that we keep up a practical interest in what is going on. I am afraid we are often careless about missionary publications, and consequently lose much of the interest we might gain from them, and much of the help we might accord to our brethren in the colonies. Let us, on the Friday, turn from the novels, and give up other light occupations, and take to our missionary study. Then, let us remember to thank God for the wonderful things He has done in binding together all the parts of the Catholic Church, and especially the parts of the communion to which we have the privilege of belonging. Let us, in the Eucharist, not forget to thank God for the way in which he has bound us together, and for the way in which the Church at home has fed and strenghened the Church

abroad. So I think we shall really show we are thankful to God. What better thansgiving could we offer to God than that of the old German chorale?—

"Now thank we all our God,
With hearts and hands and voices,
Who wondrous things hath done,
In whom His world rejoices."

The Rev. HUGH HULEATT, Vicar of St. John's, Bethnal Green, late Chaplain (First Class) of Her Majesty's Forces.

I RISE, in this great assembly, in fulfilment of a promise given to loyal sons and daughters of the Church of England who, in the far North-west of America, thousands of miles from their native land, are yearning for the ministry and services of the Church of their Baptism—their mother Church. During my recent holiday, I travelled 12,127 miles by sea and land, and on five successive Sundays performed Divine service amongst Anglo-Saxon colonists in all sorts of places, and in the most distant regions of Manitoba, Assineboia, and Saskatchewan, and wherever I officiated I found the most extraordinary yearning for the services of the Church of England. In no other quarter of the globe have I ever met with such enthusiastic love for the Church. Until my recent visit to North-west America, I had no conception of the tremendous hold that the Church of England has on the affections of her lay members. Yes, and blessed be God in this new country the old hostility of dissenters against the Church entirely disappears. Wherever I went throughout the extremes of that North-west Territory, I found dissenters yearning for the Sacraments and the services of the Church, and if we would only give dissenters an equal advantage with ourselves in the Church's services, by using paged Prayer Books, and giving out the page at every change in the service, so that dissenters could follow as easily as the churchmen, why then, from what I have lately seen, I feel convinced that the great mass of pious dissenters in North-west America would heartily cast in their lot with the Church, and in their love and admiration of the Prayer Book, would stir up the whole Church to a higher and more devotional celebration of public worship. In those vast regions of Manitoba, Assineboia, and Saskatchewan, from Winnepeg to the Rocky Mountains, a distance of over 1,000 miles as the crow flies, wherever I officiated I found the colonists, with their wives and families, coming ten and twelve miles in their wagons to avail themselves of the ministry of the Church. Just like that Macedonian, mentioned in the sixteenth chapter of the Acts, who appeared to St. Paul in a vision, and induced the great Apostle of the Gentiles to leave one Continent for another, and devote all his energies to European conversion, just like that Macedonian of old, but not in a night vision but in living flesh and blood, Englishmen and Englishwomen, husbands, wives, and children, from the rich prairies of the great North-west of America are crying out to the beloved mother Church at home, "Come over and help us." Up to their power, yes and beyond their power, the English colonists themselves are willing to do their own part in this matter. Wherever I went in the North-west of America, the colonists were continually impressing upon me that they were ready and willing to build their clergymen's houses, to plough up and prepare for the crop, and help to gather in the harvests on their clergyman's land section, so as to relieve him in those secular matters, and leave him free for his spiritual duties. The colonists are ready and willing to do everything in their power to strengthen the hands of their clergy, to make them contented and happy in the sphere of their spiritual duties; but they have not got amongst themselves men who have been educated for the ministry, and they have at present but very little ready money, and, therefore, in their difficulty, they cry out to the beloved mother Church at home, "Come over and help us," and *when her own sons and daughters*, who have been baptized in her own bosom here at home, before they went forth to Her Majesty's Dominions in North West America, cry out to the mother at home for bread, the mother must not give her children refuse. The Church of England must not make the same mistake that, in the last century, lost the English nation the United States, namely, that anything is good enough for the colonies. No, no,

our colonies are worthy of the very best that the Church can send forth to the work, for in the ministry, as well as in every profession and grade of society, the man who is a failure at home is not likely to prove a success in a colony. Let no one mistake me as if I once looked at the ministry of our Church already at work in those vast regions. I rejoice, as an eye-witness, to bear testimony to the earnestness of their zeal, their love, and their loyalty. The Bishop of Rupert's Land, at Winnepeg, is very highly regarded for his work sake, and not only like King Saul of old does he out-top all others by the beard and brawny shoulders, but also in the cause of education in the North-west of America, he has done one of the greatest works that has ever been achieved by a bishop of the English Church. The Bishop of Saskatchewan is also active and energetic in the administration of his vast diocese, but those two bishops have under their superintendence not quite fifty ordained clergy, and what are they among so many? It is a physical impossibility that they can meet the spiritual wants of the colonists, scattered over those vast regions. The great tidal wave of emigration that within the last few years has swept in on Winnepeg and the North-west, has well-nigh overwhelmed those pioneers of the Church, and the overworked bishops and clergy, as well as the pastorless laity throughout the length and breadth of that vast territory, are crying out to the Church at home, "Come over and help us." The English-speaking population of those vast regions has a first claim on the Crown and the Church's ministry. Never in her whole history has the Church of England had a grander field for ingathering a spiritual harvest for her Lord than in this North-west Territory. The Church of Rome has recognised the importance of the work, by retaining at Winnepeg one of her most talented ecclesiastics, Archbishop Tache, who may be called the Cardinal Mazarin of the nineteenth century. The Presbyterians began by sending one of their most gifted and talented preachers from Ottawa, to take up his residence at Winnepeg as his head-quarters. The Methodists are making mighty efforts to be the first to occupy this rich portion of the Lord's vineyard, and when other Churches and religious denominations are thus rapidly advancing, shall the Church of England lag behind? On this point a leading Canadian churchman said to me, "If the Church at this crisis fails in her duty, then other religious bodies will get hold of the pastorless flocks." When the souls of the sons and daughters of the Church of England are at stake, I hold that we have no liberty to hand them over to the care of strangers. The souls of her children is the precious treasure of the Church, and to give away that treasure to strangers is to sin against God. "The Lord forbid it me that I should give the inheritance of my fathers unto Thee." Those words of Naboth to Ahab apply to this matter. Yes, the command of God, the love of Christ, and the cry of our own kith and kin from that far off North-west, all claim at the hands of the Church of England that in the strength of her Lord she offer of her very best to this work in the great North-west. The Church taking, as her unalienable right, the very foremost place in the spiritual exaltation of the Anglo-Saxon race, so that in those vast regions on the Western side of the Atlantic, more sons and daughters shall be borne unto her Lord by the old Church of England, than even all whom she has raised to His honour and praise in those British Islands.

The Rev. R. Bruce Dickson, Org. Sec. S.P.G., Cadmore Vicarage, High Wycombe.

Perhaps I may venture to say that, as an Englishman, I am proud of my country, and I am anxious to realise myself, and to help others, if it may be, to realise why we are so great a nation. We talk of the Emperor of all the Russias, with his ninety millions of subjects, but what is that to our gracious Queen, who is Ruler over more than one-fifth part of the population of the whole world—not in one vast continent—but in countries in different parts of the world. England is only like a speck upon the ocean, with her 35 millions of inhabitants, but our fellow-subjects number some 300 millions in different parts of the world. And why are we so great? It is easy to see how different parts might be cut off until our empire consisted simply and solely of the British isles, and nothing more. I cannot see any other explanation of

our greatness than that Almighty God, for His own wise purpose, has made us the nation we are, and has entrusted to our care these 300 millions of souls, many of whom are heathen. If we do not do what we can to see that they know the Gospel of Jesus Christ, which we profess, can we wonder if our great nation were to fall, as the ancient nations of Greece and Rome fell. We send our children out of the country at a present rate of some 500,000 every year. Emigrant vessels will take 1,000 in one voyage. We send them to our colonies, and we leave them sometimes, alas, alone. It is no use preaching to the heathen of the blessings of Christianity if we leave our own sons and daughters out there to become worse than the heathen amongst whom they live. I have known a case of one of our favourite colonies, to which men from England have gone—not men taken from the alleys of our great cities, but the younger sons of some of our best families—and having been left without the means of grace, they have given way to practices and habits too revolting to describe, and too awful and degraded to speak of in an assembly like this. They were, indeed, instead of being for the heathen around an example of what Christian gentlemen should be, warnings to them. Things are better now, because the bishop there discovered what was going on, and appealed to the manliness of these men, and to the Christian teaching which they had received under their parents' roof, and it might be, from their mother's lips. Over and over again we do leave our fellow-countrymen uncared for and untended, and when we hear that people are pouring into our own country in North-west Canada at the rate of 1,000 a day, we can see that there is great need for us to pray for them, and to send men and money to help them.

TOWN HALL,

Friday Evening, October 5th.

CONVERSAZIONE AND FINAL MEETING.

A Social Entertainment or *Conversazione* (as is usual at Church Congresses) was given to the members by the Worshipful the Mayor of Reading. The attendance was large, and in the course of the evening the following speeches were made :—

The Right Hon. Sir John Mowbray, Bart., M.P.

Mr. Mayor, my Lord, Ladies and Gentlemen :—I have the pleasure and privilege of proposing the first resolution, which is, "That the Congress desires to express its sincere thanks to the Lord Bishop of Oxford, for the able manner in which he has performed the duties of President." This is a resolution that requires no seconder, or, indeed, any speech. All of us who have the good fortune to live in this diocese, and have watched the career of his lordship, have reason to thank God for the blessing of so good a bishop. For ten years past I have attended all the Conferences in the diocese, and there I have had frequent opportunities of observing his lordship's clearness of head, firmness of will, and courtesy of manner, which cannot be equalled or excelled by any other prelate upon the episcopal bench. We have now learned to appreciate the same impartiality, the same clear-headedness, the same dignity and good temper, and we have to thank him for the able way in which he preserved order and discipline in the Congress during the last four days. But, independent of all that, we desire to express our gratitude to his lordship for those admirable addresses to which we all listened on the opening day, and also at the close of our devotional meeting. We were all carried away by them, and I trust we may all profit by the wise and fatherly words of our diocesan. I dare not say more.

The Right Rev. the PRESIDENT.

MR. MAYOR, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN:—Sir John Mowbray has drawn a very kind and flattering picture of me, but really this Congress has been so harmonious, that it has not given me any opportunity of exhibiting those fine qualities which he has attributed to me. Had it been a stormy one, distinguished by frequent ebullitions of feeling, I might have been able to have given you some idea of my powers as a chairman; but I had only to watch, and to rely on the general good feeling and brotherly charity of those who took part in the Congress. I have never wanted a supporter—I have one now. (His lordship was leaning on the arm of the honorary secretary.) I thank him, and you all, for the hearty support which your President has received all through this Congress. Before I sit down, I have a duty to discharge. I assume that I have your consent to an act of simple justice to those who have made us at Reading their guests. I have to thank the Mayor and Corporation for allowing us the use of these buildings, and for the courtesy and kindness they have shown us all. This Town Hall, which has been so useful to us, has been built only in the course of the last few years, by the munificence of some of your leading townsmen. At present, however, I have only to speak of the kindness and liberality of the Mayor and Corporation. I will say to the Mayor, that very much of the good feeling displayed by the Congress at its meetings is due to the way in which its members have been received by him and the good people of Reading. The temper and feeling of the Congress has been greatly affected by your kindly hospitality, and your desire to make all the members comfortable and welcome. The Mayor has been an active member of all the committees, and at last he has lavished upon us a generous hospitality. Long may he enjoy the regard and esteem of his fellow citizens, and long may he enjoy health and prosperity. In your name I shall read a very brief address to him, which is as follows:—"The members of the Congress tender their heartiest thanks to the Mayor and Corporation of the ancient Borough of Reading, for the cordial reception afforded to them, and for placing at their service the Municipal Buildings." So say we all.

BLACKALL SIMONDS, Esq., Mayor of Reading.

MY LORD BISHOP:—It gives me very great pleasure to be able to become the mouthpiece of the Corporation, in returning thanks for the compliment you have paid the inhabitants of Reading. I am sure that it is generally felt that the town has been greatly honoured by being selected as the meeting place of this year's Church Congress. I feel sure that the Congress has been productive, not only of satisfaction to us, but also of great good in bringing us into contact with some of the most learned and wisest of the ecclesiastics, as well as with some of the leading politicians of the realm, and with that large body of hard-working Christian ministers who work amongst us unseen, so that we hardly know what a large and influential body they represent. The Congress has been to me, personally, a time of unmixed pleasure. It has been a treat to listen to the grand eloquence of some of the speakers, and I have had my ideas on some subjects modified, and on others strengthened by what I have heard. It has been one of those opportunities of instruction seldom recurring, for which we ought to be very thankful. I hope that this Congress will do a great deal to endear the Church of England to the nation, and to show that her lines are broad enough to contain all faithful subjects of the Queen; so that as time goes on the contact between the Church and the laity may soften the asperities which now keep alive divisions in our Christian bodies. When I listened to the flattering remarks of your lordship, I was reminded of the speech of Canon Hole, and the monkey who was told he was deserving enough to have a barrel-organ all to himself. I have to thank you again, and to say that when I recollect the kindly feelings you have so well expressed, I have only to congratulate myself and my fellow-townspeople on the presence of the Church Congress this year in Reading.

The Rev. CANON HOARE, Tunbridge Wells.

WE have just united in an unanimous address of thanks to the Mayor and Corporation, who, as public men, have placed the public buildings of the town at our disposal, but I am now going to speak of private individuals who have opened their houses with a generous hospitality to those members of the Congress who have come as

strangers amongst them. It was very pleasant to find oneself on arriving at Reading, in the very midst of kind Christian hospitality, and I am certain that this has been the experience of all who have come from a distance. I have to propose "That the Congress expresses its gratitude to the people of Reading for the kind and Christian hospitality with which they have received many of its members." I have been requested to connect a name with this resolution. If I had been left to myself, I should most certainly have proposed that of my own most hospitable host and hostess; but I must act, on this occasion, according to orders, and therefore will connect with this expression of thanks, the name of Mr. John Walter, M.P., who has contributed so much to the well-being of the Congress.

John Walter, Esq., M.P.

In the name of numerous kind friends and neighbours, on whose behalf I speak, I can only say that we all appreciate the very kind manner in which mention of this subject has been received in this assembly. During this week we have been contemplating not the Church militant or triumphant, but the Church itinerant, and I hope we have done our best to accommodate ourselves to that passing phase of her character. I have done my part as well as I could, and I am sure that all the others have done the same to ensure the success of this Congress. Such a rarely recurring gathering brings old and dear friends from all parts of the country together, enabling them to renew old friendships, while at the same time strangers are introduced to one another, and possibly such introductions may lead to life-long friendships. At any rate I earnestly hope and trust that our visitors will carry away with them a pleasant memory of Reading, and a feeling of kindness to those who have received them.

The Ven. Archdeacon Balston, Vicar of Bakewell, Derbyshire.

We have heard during the week many able papers and powerful speeches, which must have cost the several Readers and Speakers much time and pains to prepare; which it has been our great pleasure and profit to hear. It has been truly said that the effect of these Congresses is to bring men of divers opinions together. We can afford to differ when we do differ with good temper. In this hall this morning was presented, it is true, a scene of excitement; a very pleasant meeting, nevertheless, to discuss a subject on which there is much difference of opinion. In some Congresses the subjects have been so arranged, that there has been a decided preference for one room over the other, but in this it would be difficult to say which section has excited the greater interest. More than once I have wished to be present in both places at the same time, but not having the power of ubiquity, I have been obliged to remain contented where I was. It is only right that some public acknowledgment should be made to the Readers and Speakers who have taken great pains and spared no trouble to make the Congress successful. I, therefore, move the following resolution, coupling with it the name of Dr. Acland:—"That our best thanks be accorded to His Grace the Archbishop of Canterbury, and to their lordships the Bishops of Winchester and Meath, and also to the Readers and Speakers who have contributed so ably to the discussions, and of the Congress."

Dr. Acland, Oxford,

Briefly returned thanks on behalf of the Readers and Speakers.

The Very Rev. Dr. Purey-Cust, Dean of York.

I have now to propose "That the patient and efficient services of the Committees and Secretaries, the great ability of the Hon. Architect, and the ready assistance of the Organist of Reading, and of the Stewards, be gratefully acknowledged." There is no man in this assembly who has more reason to adopt the words of this resolution than I have. For fifteen years I knew the patience and work of the good people of Reading, and however old I may grow I shall never forget the debt of gratitude I

owed them in the days gone by. I look back twenty years to the Reading I knew, and in my then daily contact with the gentlemen who have been our hon. secretaries and stewards I learnt to esteem their patience and efficiency. This building in which we are is of itself a proof of their patience and efficiency, and it is to them that you owe the wonderful condition of the Church in this town. There is not a church in Reading that has not been restored, and as fast as the population increases so is the church accommodation increased. I know that my brother clergymen will agree with me that they never lack the services of the laity. Whenever they want advice, or funds, or teachers, or district visitors, they have only to make their wants known, and efficient help rallies to their standard. For weeks these gentlemen, the hon. secretaries and stewards, have been labouring to secure a successful Congress. I congratulate my friends on the success they have achieved. This Congress, it will be found, will not merely confer a benefit on the town, but its effect will spread out through the whole length and breadth of the Church. I propose this resolution most heartily, and congratulate them most sincerely, and I pray they may be spared by God's Providence to do still more work for the welfare of the Church to the glory of His Holy Name. I couple with the resolution the Rev. N. T. Garry, whose patience and efficiency has gained for himself the respect and love of all who know him.

The Rev. NICHOLAS T. GARRY, Vicar of S. Mary's, Reading.

ONE great reason that makes it fitting that I should be called upon to respond to this vote of thanks is that the words of the present Vicar of S. Mary's come near to those of the late Vicar, whose steps I am always glad to follow. I am deeply sensible of the kind and cordial manner in which the resolution has been received. I am but one of a body of twelve secretaries, six clerical and six lay, and I feel that we have one and all done our best to make the Congress succeed; and in that loving co-operation of clergy and laity we have fresh proof of the unity of purpose and mutual confidence, which is the best omen for the future of the Church of England. The cordial manner in which you have passed the vote of thanks, to which I have the honour to reply, shows that our efforts have been crowned with success; indeed, those who were present at the grand meetings which crowded the Congress Hall, at times I fear to inconvenience, had an evident proof that the Church Congress of that year may be ranked amongst the most successful of these annual gatherings in different parts of the country, which are doing so much to make known and to strengthen the Church of England. In the name of my fellow-secretaries, and in my own, I return you our most sincere thanks.

The Ven. W. EMERY, Archdeacon and Canon of Ely; Permanent Secretary of the Church Congress.

IN the name of the Mayor, I have to state that the Free Library and Museum are open to-night as well as these rooms. The number of members who have attended this Church Congress have been at least 5,542—viz., by full tickets 3,652, and by day tickets 1,890, so that this Congress has been one of the largest. In the name of the Bishop of Carlisle, I invite all to Carlisle for the next Church Congress, where a hearty welcome from the City and the Diocese awaits those who may be spared to go. One thing more calls for special remark in conclusion, and that is the very ample and comfortable accommodation which has been provided for us in the fine temporary Congress Hall, for which I feel sure we all tender our most grateful thanks to the Committee and the Honorary Architect.

Some music and conversation followed, and the Congress of 1883 was thus brought to a successful close.

APPENDIX A.

Henry Wright, Esq., Reading.

When I saw the subject of friendly societies on the programme, I rejoiced exceedingly; but I must confess to a feeling of disappointment at the way in which it has been treated. Seeing this is the first time the subject has been formally brought before the Congress, I did expect we should have been treated, at all events by the appointed readers of papers, to something like an historical account of the origin, rise, and progress of friendly societies, instead of which the discussion has degenerated into an advocacy of the particular schemes and societies in which the speakers are interested, securing them from this platform a good gratuitous advertisement. I feel sorely tempted to advertise the small society to which I belong, but I did not rise for that purpose, but to say a few words on the advice tendered by Mr. Blackley to those of you interested in the subject. He rightly denounces those fraudulent societies established and carried on by designing schemers who flourish and fatten on the hard earnings of many of the most ignorant among the labouring people; but, he drew no distinction between these and the large number of clubs established over the country years ago by these much abused working men, about whom he is so sarcastic. He should remember that the men who formed these clubs had no county magnates to pay fifteen or twenty guineas for actuarial tables, but they worked them honestly and with the best intentions, according to the little light they at that time had on the subject, their sole desire being to provide in the best way they knew for a rainy day when it should come on them. But, "they are not sound," says Mr. Blackley, and he advises you to look into them, subject them to various actuarial tests, and if they do not fulfil this and that condition, throw them on one side. And what does he recommend in their place? He has not a generous word to say for the great affiliated societies, but recommends "The Church of England Temperance Benefit Society, established by my friend, Mr. Mark Knowles," a society, which that gentleman in advocating its claims, tells us "has been established five years, and numbers 700 members." Why, one of the affiliated societies initiates more members than this every week. I ask you not to listen to such advice as Mr. Blackley's. If there is a club in your parish, and on examination you do not find it sound, instead of casting it aside as useless, try and see if you cannot help to make it sound. Aid the struggling, hardworking, members by your advice and assistance, which, I am sure, they will gladly welcome, and which should have been given years ago. Had this been done, and you had followed the example set by one whose name is venerated—I allude to the late Bishop of Chichester, who became a working member of the Oddfellows, and went through all the offices that he might thoroughly understand the question—we should not have to lament over the unsoundness of so many societies to-day. I congratulate Mr. Blackley on the extreme modesty he showed in alluding to his pet compulsory insurance scheme. He spoke of it "with bated breath." I was in hopes it was dead and buried, as indeed it deserves to be. Let me beg of you, instead of listening to this Utopian scheme, to be practical, and assist in improving and developing the societies now in existence. I have my claim to address you in the fact that I have been for 25 years an unpaid officer of the most successful society in existence, and if you wish to establish a society in your parish, let it be a branch of one of the great affiliated societies, for depend on it, however much Mr. Blackley and his friends may ignore them, they are a fact, nay, a factor, and an important one in this question. Look at the Manchester Unity, with its half a million members, a capital of five millions, receiving annually three-quarters of a million, paying half a million for sickness and death, and saving annually a quarter of a million. You need not talk of national insurance with such facts as these before you. These societies are known all over the world, and wherever a man is he may participate in their benefits, and retain his membership, but if he belongs to a local society, no matter how good it may be, in the event of his emigrating, or going to another part of the country, he would have to join another society, and pay increased contributions. I would, therefore, urge you to take up these affiliated societies and adopt them.

APPENDIX B.

The Rev. W. J. KNOX-LITTLE, Rector of St. Albans, Cheetwood, Manchester, and Canon of Worcester.

Apropos of what Canon Hole has said, and of what the good bishop said, I want to say this to you, which I have ventured to say to working men before. I don't know anything about the condition of working men in Reading, but I have a very intimate acquaintance with very large numbers of working men elsewhere, and I have a growing acquaintance with them, I am happy to say. I can fully agree with Canon Hole, that it is quite necessary for a clergyman to feel he is made of the same material as working men. I, for my part, never felt anything else. At school, Mr. Dean, you and I were taught the old motto: "*Ne sutor ultra crepidam*," in other words, "Let every fellow stick to his own trade;" and my trade—I speak seriously—is religion, the Christian religion, and I really cannot talk to you about anything else; and if you don't like that, hiss instead of clapping, and then I'll sit down. But if you will allow me to talk about my own trade, there are one or two points of the Christian faith I should like to speak to you about quite from my heart. In the first place I would say to you working men of Reading, you are subject, as we are all subject, to one great power. You are subject, I suppose, to the kind of feeling, or the way of looking at things, or the temper or habit of public opinion, which spring from thoughts that pass from mouth to mouth, and from heart to heart, from mind to mind in workshops and warehouses, and which in gusts and breezes is liable to carry you off your feet. This power is called, in the Bible and in the Catechism, "the world." This it is by which good men, who are trying to be true and serious Christians, are sometimes carried off their feet; they are overcome by "the world." They are first ridiculed, and then, perhaps, persecuted, and so they sometimes become the victims of the world; they bow down before the public opinion of some five or six dozen fellows like themselves; they knuckle down, and turn cowards—in the true sense of the term. Now I want to warn you to remember this—if you and I are to enter into the kingdom of heaven we have to conquer "the world." I once knew a little lad very intimately, who had a great desire to become a sailor. You know boys will get these desires in their heads. Sometimes they die out, but in this little lad the desire didn't die out. A sailor he would be, and a sailor he was. It so happened that, when he entered the navy, he found himself in certain difficulties about religious observances, and about saying his prayers, arising from a certain number of people around him —sailors like himself—who didn't altogether hold with "saying your prayers;" he suffered in consequence of his view on the subject. "Will you kindly tell me," he asked a friend, "is it my duty to say my prayers upon the floor, or may I say them in the hammock?" And that friend was obliged to write back to say, "There is this sentence in Scripture, although it goes to my heart to quote it to you—'He that is not ashamed of Me, and of My words, in an adulterous and sinful generation, of him will I not be ashamed;' and so I advise you, say

your prayers upon the floor." Within three months of that letter that boy died. He died too swiftly for those who had loved him to be with him. Some, who knew, wrote of him at the time of his funeral. They told of the example that fellow set, doing duty punctually and well, and leaving behind him a noble memory; and when he died there was not a dry eye around his grave. He had conquered "the world." Now, there are workshops in England where this happens—where little lads come in to learn their work; and when they begin their work they mean well. They have been taught to say their prayers, to resist their evil appetites, and to respect God. They go into a workshop, and there is a sort of moral atmosphere around them, where God is disregarded, where there is unseemly conversation, and so the poor little lad's tone of mind becomes severely lowered. Lads are sometimes placed in this position. If they are to learn their trade, whatever it is, they must obey the demands of those who have the power to teach them; and one of the conditions of their being taught sometimes is to break rules, and so to do violence to conscience; to please men less well-principled than themselves—to bring in beer, or to go out and get tobacco, or to do something that their masters have forbidden. My brethren, I beseech you, those of you who are fathers loving your own boys, and if you know how difficult it is to guide and sustain them amid the dangers of this world, to help them to be honest, noble-hearted, pure, straightforward English lads; if any of you have ever loved a child of your own, help them, as your own, to fight "the world." Above all things, don't help to create a public opinion which makes it difficult for those who are beginning to face the struggles of life to do their duty. And bear with me when I add this: when we come to the question of that second enemy that assaults the Christian, the flesh, I desire to endorse, with great sincerity, what has been said by the Bishop of Carlisle. All serious clergymen, and I hope all serious laymen, who really love their fellow-creatures, and love the Englishmen among whom they have to work, know it is a precious hard thing to conquer "the flesh;" that it is all very easy to talk, but that in our big cities our young men are desperately tempted. This is a battle we must fight out. If you are to have the great dignity, young man, of loving your sweetheart with a true heart, with a manly and noble affection, and with the intention of making her one day your wife; if you are to reach the hour when that wife shall be your greatest joy, your strongest support, the protection and consolation of your hard worked life; if you are to be a noble-hearted Englishmen; if your children are to cling about your neck in true respect and fearless love; if you are to be a good citizen, a good Christian, a right-hearted man; to live nobly, and then, by the merits of the Redeemer, to die peacefully—Oh! in the name of the Perfect Purity, resist the flesh! There are, I know, a number of persons who say it is nonsense, "You cannot do it." That is an "infernal lie." I say it advisedly. Then there is our third enemy, and I dwell upon him for a moment—the Devil. The Devil, being a real person—though out of fashion at present, except as a myth or an imagination—tries to do two things with all men, and therefore with working men. He hates love; all true lovingness between man and man he hates, and he tries to separate class from class. He is a murderer; *and* he hates truth. He is a liar, and therefore he tries to drag you away from the Christian faith. He is at the

bottom of all the Atheistic propaganda. He makes Englishmen imagine that it is consistent with common sense to expect to explain the mystery of the heavens, and the mystery of the earth, and the mystery of mankind, by the revelation God has given. Fight the Devil. Oh ! try to "love one another with a pure heart fervently." I hope religion will teach the working men of Reading to say their prayers, to do their duty, to attend their church, to be good husbands, to be good fathers and good friends, and to cling to the faith of One who was a working man, and by His grace you and I certainly shall not be separated when there shall be a new heavens and a new earth wherein dwelleth righteousness.

List of Church Congresses.

Date.	Town.	President.
1861	Cambridge	Archdeacon of Ely (Dr. France).
1862	Oxford	Bishop of Oxford (Dr. Wilberforce).
1863	Manchester	Bishop of Manchester (Dr. Prince Lee).
1864	Bristol	Bishop of Gloucester and Bristol (Dr. Ellicott).
1865	Norwich	Bishop of Norwich (Hon. Dr. Pelham).
1866	York	Archbishop of York (Dr. Thomson).
1867	Wolverhampton	Bishop of Lichfield (Dr. Lonsdale).
1868	Dublin	Archbishop of Dublin (Dr. Trench).
1869	Liverpool	Bishop of Chester (Dr. Jacobson).
1870	Southampton	Bishop of Winchester (Dr. Wilberforce).
1871	Nottingham	Bishop of Lincoln (Dr. Wordsworth).
1872	Leeds	Bishop of Ripon (Dr. Bickersteth).
1873	Bath	Bishop of Bath and Wells (Lord Arthur Hervey).
1874	Brighton	Bishop of Chichester (Dr. Durnford).
1875	Stoke	Bishop of Lichfield (Dr. Selwyn).
1876	Plymouth	Bishop of Exeter (Dr. Temple).
1877	Croydon	Archbishop of Canterbury (Dr. Tait).
1878	Sheffield	Archbishop of York (Dr. Thomson).
1879	Swansea	Bishop of S. David's (Dr. Jones).
1880	Leicester	Bishop of Peterborough (Dr. Magee).
1881	Newcastle	Bishop of Durham (Dr. Lightfoot).
1882	Derby	Bishop of Lichfield (Dr. Maclagan).
1883	Reading	Bishop of Oxford (Dr. Mackarness).

Appointment for 1884—Carlisle.

CONGRESS SPEAKERS, &c.

Abraham, Bishop, 283, 374, 537.
Acland, Dr., 146, 548.
Anson, Canon, 530.
Arbuthnot, Sir A., 539.
Armfield, Rev. H. T., 116.
Appleton, Rev. R., 310.

Baker, Rev. H. R., 409.
Balston, Archdeacon, 378, 548.
Barker, Rev. T., 542.
Barnwell, Rev. C., 359.
Barry, Canon, 269, 525.
Bathurst, Archdeacon, 158.
Baynes, C., Esq., 157.
Beauchamp, Right Hon. Earl, 80.
Bedford, Bishop of, 160, 266, 377, 433.
Belcher, Rev. Dr., 357, 492.
Bennett, Rev. T., 81, 259, 498.
Bickersteth, Rev. E., 308.
Bird, Rev. J. G., 362.
Blackley, Rev. W. L., 237.
Bowlby, Canon, 407.
Brabazon, Lord, 199.
Buchanan, Rev. J. H., 454.
Burrows, Professor, 123, 489.
Butcher, J., Esq., 258.
Butler, Canon, 175.
Butler, Rev. A. G., 196.

Canterbury, Archbishop of, 1.
Carlile, Rev. W., 132, 452.
Carlisle, Lord Bishop of, 43, 253, 262.
Carr, Rev. A., 387.
Carter, Canon, 135.
Carter, Rev. W. S., 255.
Chavasse, Rev. F. J., 461.
Cheyne, Rev. T. K., 85.
Christopher, Rev. A. M. W., 331.
Churchill, Lord E. S., 485.
Clark, F. le Gros, Esq., 56.
Clifton, Mr., 426.
Colman, Rev. Dr. L., 230, 538.
Compton, Rev. B., 153, 443.
Conroy, Sir J., Bart., 334.
Cowden-Cole, Rev. J., 133, 404.
Currie, Sir E. H., 399.

Darby, Archdeacon, 155, 409.
Darling, Rev. W. S., 542.
Davidson, Very Rev. Randall T., 514.
Denison, Archdeacon, 330, 383.
Dibdin, L. T., Esq., 506.
Dickson, Rev. R. B., 545.
Dodd, J. T., Esq., 494.
Douglas, Hon. and Rev. Hy., 310, 541.
Du-Port, Rev. C. D., 426.

Ellison, Canon, 358.
Emery, Ven. Archdeacon W., 84, 150, 285, 334, 384, 513, 549.
Engstrom, Rev. C. L., 64.
Espin, Rev. T. E., 496, 521.
Everard, Rev. Geo., 159, 380.

Farler, Archdeacon, 299.
Fergusson, Major, 411.
Fisher, Canon, 363.
Fletcher, Rev. H., 512.
Flower, Professor, 36.
Forsyth, Wm., Esq., 81.
Foster, Rev. A. J., 80.

Garry, Rev. N. T., 549.
Gedge, S., Esq., 446, 484.
Geikie, Dr., 113.
Girdlestone, Canon, 112, 449.
Goe, Rev. F. F., 338.
Goldie, Rev. C. D., 411.
Gray, Rev. H. B., 386.
Gregory, Canon, 84, 401.
Griffith, Rev. Dr., 360.
Ground, Rev. W. D., 65.

Hatchard, Rev. A., 110.
Hayman, Dr., 83, 474.
Headlam, Rev. S. D., 428.
Headley, Rev. T. G., 337.
Heaton, W. H., Esq., 205.
Hessey, Archdeacon, 214.
Hoare, Canon, 309, 429, 467, 547.
Hole, Canon, 272.
Holland, Canon F. J., 354.
Holland, Canon Scott, 194.
Hope, Rt. Hon. A. J. B. B., M.P., 229, 448, 522, 524.
Howson, Very Rev. J. S. (Dean of Chester), 109, 140, 381.
Hubbard, Rt. Hon. J. G., M.P., 388.
Huleatt, Rev. H., 544.

Ince, Canon, 329.

James, Rev. H., 469.
Jeffcock, Rev. J. T., 353.
Jelf, Canon, 543.

King, Canon, 322, 455.
Knowles, M., Esq., 243.
Knox-Little, Canon, 551.

Lahore, Lord Bishop of, 288.
Lane, Rev. W. M., 408.
Legge, Hon. and Rev. A., 82.
Leighton, S., Esq., M.P., 68,
Lyttelton, Hon. and Rev. A. T., 170, 327.

Maclagan, General R., 304.
Makins, Colonel W. T., M.P., 235.
Marson, Rev. C. L., 431.
May, Rev. Dr., 307.
Mayow, Rev. M. W., 232.
Meath, Lord Bishop of, 20, 154, 310.
Medd, Canon, 437.
Millard, J. H. Esq., 131, 355.
Miller, Rev. E., 78.
Mitchinson, Bishop, 305, 533.
Moore, Rev. Aubrey L., 47.
Moore, Rev. Preb., 412.
Mowbray, Rt. Hon. Sir J., Bart., M.P., 73, 276, 336, 546.
Muir, Sir W., 296.
Murdoch, C. T., Esq., 385.

Nelson, Earl, 152, 452, 536.
Norris, Rev. W. F., 405.

Osborne, Rev. J. F., 362.
Overy, Rev. H., 134, 256.
Oxenham, Rev. F. N., 500.
Oxford, Lord Bishop of, 29, 68, 162, 205, 260, 266, 278, 382, 429, 455, 472, 502, 523, 524, 547.

Paget, Rev. E. C., 540.
Parker, J., Esq., 453, 510.
Pelham Hon. T. H., 126.
Penney, Rev. W. H., 308.
Perry, Bishop, 62, 511.
Philipps, Rev. Sir James E., Bart., 360.
Phillimore, W. G. F., Esq., 430, 502.
Phillips, Rev. S., 234, 303, 453.
Ponsonby, Rev. J. F., 72.
Portal, W. S., Esq., 251.
Porter, Rev. Dr., 488.
Pott, Archdeacon, 128.
Potter, Rev. J. H., 257.
Pritchard, Rev. Professor, 54.

Randall, Archdeacon, 205.
Randall, Rev. R. W., 343, 515.
Rawlinson, Canon, 107.
Richards, H. C., Esq., 406, 499.
Rickards, Sir George K., 75.
Ridding, Rev. Dr., 162.
Roe, Rev. H., 281, 410, 498.
Rowley, Rev. H., 309.
Ryder, Admiral A. P., 181.

Salmon, Rev. E. A., 253, 543.
Sanday, Rev. Professor W., 91.
Sclater-Booth, Right Hon. G., M.P., 223.
Sergeant, Rev. E. W., 368.
Shuttleworth, Rev. H. C., 422.
Simonds, B., Esq. (Mayor of Reading), 547.
Spottiswoode, G. A., Esq., 120.
Stanton, Rev. V. H., 114, 197.
Stevens, Rev. T., 361.
Stock, E., Esq., 471.
Storrs, Rev. W. T., 301.
Sturges, Rev. E., 245.
Sumner, Rev. G. H., 492.

Talbot, Rev. E. S., 333.
Talbot, J. G., Esq., M.P., 148, 348.
Thompson, Rev. C. J., 130, 406.
Thompson, T. C., Esq., M.P., 351.
Tomkins, Rev. H. G., 104, 432.
Trevarthen, J., Esq., 128.
Trevor, Canon, 233, 482.

Venables, Canon, 450.
Vincent, Rev. T., 236.

Walter, J., Esq., M.P., 225, 548.
Welldon, Rev. J. E. C., 324.
West, Rev. R. T., 501.
Wickham, Rev. E. C., 364.
Wilson, Sir C. W., 98.
Wilson, J. H., Esq., 393.
Winchester, Lord Bishop of, 9, 160, 495.
Wood, Hon. C. L., 464, 520.
Wood, Rev. Dr., 386.
Woolley, Rev. G. H., 257.
Wordsworth, Canon, 317.
Wright, H. Esq., 550.

York, Dean of, 278, 417, 548.

Bemrose & Sons, Printers, Derby; and 23, Old Bailey, London.

GTU Library
2400 Ridge Road
Berkeley, CA 94709
For renewals call (510) 649-2500
All items are subject to recall.

GTU Library
3 2400 00670 5028